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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

This Executive Summary includes a description of Guam's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. A description of Guam's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement in the development and review of the SPP and APR, and how Guam will report the SPP and APR to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of Guam's FFY 2020 SPP/APR.  
  
For this FFY 2020, Guam stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2025. This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. As per OSEP's instructions, Indicators 9 and 10 do not apply to Guam. In addition, Indicator 4B also does not apply to Guam. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, Guam reports FFY 2020 data to determine if Guam met its FFY 2020 target, an explanation of slippage if Guam did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from FFY 2019, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination Letter for Guam's FFY 2019 SPP/APR.   
  
Guam stakeholders also determined new baselines and targets for Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 based on the revised calculations determined by OSEP which is outlined in the SPP/APR Measurement Table.   
  
Moreover, as required for Indicator 17, Guam's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), is included in this submission for FFY 2020.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

For relevant FFY 2020 APR Indicators, information is provided on the data collection and reporting that were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. For each Indicator that was impacted, Guam Part B reported on the impact of performance, data completeness and the validity and reliability of the data. There was an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted Guam's ability to collect the data for each impacted Indicator; and the steps Guam took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.  
  
Additionally, for Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6, Guam Part B, together with its stakeholders determined new baseline and targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025; and also indicated if this new baseline and targets will be reviewed and possibly revised, if needed, in subsequent FFY reporting periods.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

1

**General Supervision System:**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.**

As the GDOE is a Unitary System, the Principal of each public school is the representative of the public agency who supervises the provision of special education and related services to meet the unique needs of children with disabilities and is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the public agency to ensure a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for students with disabilities. The Division of Special Education provides support to the public schools in order to meet the unique needs of children with disabilities and the provision of FAPE.  
  
The Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) is under the Deputy Superintendent of Assessment and Accountability and is responsible for implementing Guam’s Integrated Monitoring System, which includes Comprehensive Monitoring, Offsite monitoring activities, and Dispute Resolution. Comprehensive Monitoring is a process that identifies and corrects procedural noncompliance with Part B IDEA requirements. It is an essential component of the Integrated Monitoring System and assists the CMO in determining a school’s strengths and weaknesses with the implementation of the IDEA and related policies and procedures. Monitoring activities include file record reviews and interviews with program personnel and parents.   
  
The CMO manages GDOE's Dispute Resolution System (State Complaints, Due Process Hearings, and Mediations). The CMO uses the Dispute Resolution System to identify and correct noncompliance in the implementation of IDEA requirements and to identify components of the system that need improvement (e.g., policies, procedures, guidelines, written agreements). As part of the monitoring activities, the compliance office examines formal dispute resolution data of schools to identify issues related to performance and helps plan onsite or other program-specific monitoring activities.

**Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

On September 23, 2014, the Guam Education Board (GEB) approved the Guam Department of Education (GDOE) State Strategic Plan, “20/20: A Clear Vision for Education on Guam.” The State Strategic Plan’s focus is not just on the implementation of reform programs, but also to invest in the long-term capacity building of Department personnel by providing training and resources on research-proven Curriculum-Instruction-Assessment-Interventions strategies and effective school structures. School Administrators, teachers and instructional personnel are presented with the research, trained on specific strategies to implement research findings, and provided opportunities to implement and refine their skills through regular reflection and collaboration with peers.  
  
This technical assistance system and mechanism ensures the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support provided to schools. GDOE has implemented several school level systems wide initiatives that are intended to improve results for all students such as Classroom Instruction That Works, to include instructional foundations, CITW with Technology and CITW with English Learners, Understanding by Design, Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), Positive Behavioral Intervention Support Systems and literacy strategies to support the implementation of Common Core and Literacy Across the Curriculum. School Principals are also required to conduct Power Walk Through for each teacher several times per year.   
  
As part of the GDOE State Strategic Plan, there is a conceptual framework for instructional leadership and school level leadership inclusive of school cadre teams who serve as resources in their respective schools, to include providing information on CCSS and other available resources. Additionally, using the standards of professional learning, each school has a collaborative learning team. These collaborative learning teams use the premise of Curriculum-Instruction-Assessment-Interventions which uses data to drive decisions to improve outcomes for all students. Moreover, the GDOE has implemented a Teacher and Principal evaluation system to allow for a systemic way for GDOE to identify areas of strengths and opportunities for improvement as a means to improve student performance on all state-level assessments.  
  
It should be noted that the GDOE State Strategic Plan is undergoing review and revision. Expected completion date for the GDOE SSP is scheduled for late April 2022.  
  
In addition, Guam Part B also has a technical assistance delivery system that includes on-site technical assistance, training and support to school teams responsible for delivering services to students with disabilities and personnel from the Division, such as related services personnel, transition teachers and consulting resource teachers-technical assistance(CRT/TAs). The technical assistance, training and support provided is based on the level of support needed by the school teams and Division personnel.  
  
There are also mechanisms in place to evaluate the effectiveness of the technical assistance, training, and support provided. Some ways in which impact measures are assessed are through the review of data compiled from the training evaluations, observations at the school sites to determine if there is any evidence of change in practices, file folder reviews, and ensuring the completion of activities described in any individual school action plans/improvement plans.  
  
Furthermore, Guam Part B received technical assistance and support for the development of Guam’s FFY 2020 State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report through OSEP-funded TA Centers and Resources such as the NCSI, NCII, NCEO, DaSY Center, IDC, ECTAC, NTACT, WINTACT and the EDFActs Partner Support Center for the required IDEA 618 data submissions to EDEN/EDFacts, and through the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS).

**Professional Development System:**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.**

As part of Guam DOE’s State Strategic Plan, one of the major components is the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and Collaborative Teams at each school. The PLCs and Collaborative Teams are structures for teachers, administrators, instructional, and support staff to come together on a regular basis to review curriculum content, share effective instructional strategies, and analyze student assessment data to monitor student progress and determine needed interventions. As a management strategy, the Collaborative Teams structure helps establish a protocol for effective communication between Divisions and groups, as well as establish goals and action steps.  
  
Additionally, with GDOE’s mission statement: “Every student: responsible, respectful, and ready for life,” several goals were developed to improve educational outcomes for all students. One such goal is that GDOE instructional personnel will meet high standards for qualifications and ongoing professional development and will be held accountable for all assigned responsibilities. There are a total of eight (8) professional development days in the GDOE School Calendar: all eight (8) days are Full-Day professional days and are designated specifically to the state-wide initiatives.  
  
In addition to these designated professional development days, there are also training days identified to focus on IEP-specific related training and support and program level needs such as Safe Crisis Management, the implementation of discipline procedures for students with disabilities, the IEP Process (initial referrals, reevaluations, eligibility, developing IEPs, transition plans, common core state standards and students with disabilities), training specific to CCSS and Alternate Assessments based on Alternate Achievement Standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities, training for early childhood special education staff and Head Start staff on instructional strategies and practices that are research and evidence-based to improve the outcomes for children, most especially to promote children’s’ social-emotional skills, understanding their problem behaviors and use of positive approaches to help them learn appropriate behaviors. Monthly meetings are also held within each of the Program Units in the Division of Special Education that are focused on the program needs of each Unit.  
  
The professional development system employed by Guam ensures that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.  
  
In FFY 2020, GDOE was awarded a 5-year OSEP State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG): Project Hita Para Mo'na. This project is designed to assist GDOE in developing and implementing effective professional development for improving functional outcomes and educational results for children with disabilities, with a focus on children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD).  
  
Today’s unprecedented new normal resulting from the global public health crisis caused by the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) requires families and providers to come together to develop a new playbook for how known evidence-based practices can be effectively implemented in unknown environments from maintaining social distancing to virtual learning. This playbook will be developed with all stakeholders, especially families of children with disabilities, to ensure meaningful application of the knowns into the unknowns of today.   
  
To ensure the applicability of Project Hita Para Mo'na within the GDOE professional development system, GDOE established key partnerships to support the authentic stakeholder engagement through the use of the Leading by Convening framework for improvement: Autism Community Together (ACT), Guam’s local non-profit organization of families and supporters of individuals with ASD; University of Guam (UOG) Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service and School of Education, Guam’s local institution of higher education; and the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), the national organization for leaders in special education.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

49

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

For each of the Indicators, historical and current data was presented to show “trends” and “patterns” of performance beginning with FFY 2016 through FFY 2020. By doing this, stakeholders could see the growth or change from year to year with each of the Indicators. This was done so that stakeholders could analyze the data in order to set targets. Additionally, stakeholders also kept in mind what the end goal or end target should be by FFY 2025 for particular Indicators, such as Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 14 and worked backwards to develop targets. For each year, stakeholders determined that the targets would either remain the same or increase in percentages for particular Indicators, such as Indicators 3, 5, 6, 7, and 14. Some concerns that parents brought up included IEP team member determinations for least restrictive environments (LRE), especially for Indicators 5 and 6.   
  
A discussion of previous improvement strategies employed for particular Indicators, such as Indicators 11 and 13 were also discussed because of the issues with noncompliance. Division personnel conducted drill down exercises to get to the root causes of the noncompliance. These results were shared with the parent stakeholders to get their feedback. Parents agreed that the designation of an “Indicator 11 Monitor,” who will track the completion of evaluations, will increase the compliance with the 60-Day Timeline. In addition, for Indicator 13, parents felt that the weekly monitoring of IEPs needs to be aggressively monitored so that schools could increase their performance and thereby, improve results for youth with IEPs.   
  
For the Indicators that had newer measurements, five (5) years’ worth of data was presented to show what the performance would be for those particular Indicators if the measurements were presented with the new calculations. This was especially important for Indicators 1, 2, 5, and 6 because of the newer measurements. Once stakeholders reviewed possible performances for these Indicators and the baseline data for FFY 2020 was presented, targets were established for the remaining FFYs.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

The SPP/APR is an extremely technical report and may be difficult to understand. With this in mind, parent stakeholders agreed that having smaller focus group sessions to discuss Indicators in clusters is the best method to review the SSP/APR. This way, parents could attend the cluster meetings or focus group sessions they are highly interested in attending or that are most pertinent to their child.  
  
Although there were some meetings that were held in-person, the majority of the focus group meetings were held virtually. Information and handouts were provided to the participants beforehand so they would have an easier time following along with the discussions.  
  
Flyers were distributed and emails were sent out announcing the sessions so parents could participate either in-person or virtually. Incentives in the form of gas cards or coupons were provided and issued to parents who attended any of the sessions.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Stakeholders agreed that the mechanism for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies and evaluating progress on each of the Indicators would be done through all means: small group in-person sessions, virtual sessions for both small groups and large groups, and email correspondence.   
  
Handouts of the DRAFT SPP/APR and copies of the target setting guides were also distributed electronically and through hard copy.   
  
Stakeholders provided their input, ideas, and recommendations vocally, if they attended sessions in-person or virtually, and through email. The timeline for soliciting stakeholder input was set for Friday, January 28, 2022.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation was done through the distribution of flyers at the schools and through email announcements, through placement on the district's website, and through announcements on social media.   
  
The timeline for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies and evaluations were made available to the public by January 31, 2022 via email. Throughout the entire stakeholder process and presentation of the SPP/APR, stakeholders were in agreement with the proposed targets for each of the Indicators. By February 1, 2022, the first submission of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR will be provided to GAPSD members, with the understanding that revisions may be made upon OSEP’s review and recommendation for clarification during the week or period of clarification anticipated in April 2022.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

The Guam Department of Education is a unitary system and does not have LEAs. As required, Guam’s Part B Program will report annually to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following Guam’s submission of the APR. Guam will post the generated SPP/APR pdf version for public posting and the OSEP Determination Letter and Response Table on the GDOE website at www.gdoe.net (select “GDOE Links,” under Division Links, select “Special Education,” under Grants and Reports, click on “Guam Part B State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report”), including any revisions if Guam has revised its SPP. Guam posts its complete SPP and all APRs on the GDOE website. The link to the site is as follows: https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special%20Education/1874-State-Performance-Plan-and-Annual-Performance-Report.html

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

Guam's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised Guam of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required Guam to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed Guam to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. Guam must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance.  
  
Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Guam did not provide any data for Indicator 17. Guam must provide the required data for FFY 2020 in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.   
  
OSEP notes that Guam submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the Indicator 17 attachments included in Guam’s FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education’s IDEA website. Therefore, Guam must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

OSEP: Guam's IDEA Part B Determination for both 2020 and 2021 is "Needs Assistance." In the June 24, 2021 Determination Letter, the Department advised Guam of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required Guam to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed Guam to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. Guam must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission due February 1, 2022, on:  
  
(1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and  
(2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance.  
  
Guam RESPONSE:  
Guam's determination for 2021 reported a score of zero ("0") for the "long standing noncompliance" indicator in the 2021 Compliance Matrix for Guam Part B's grant special conditions and uncorrected identified noncompliance. Guam, therefore, provides the following information related to the technical assistance received and actions taken related to Guam's Part B grant special condition:  
(1) The technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance: Guam continues to work with the Department's Risk Management Service (RMS) to address Guam Department of Education's (GDOE's) Special Conditions. The GDOE Comprehensive Corrective Action Plan (CCAP) describes the required activities - Letters from RMS and GDOE CCAP reports can be found on the GDOE website: http://gdoe.net; and  
(2) The actions Guam took as a result of the technical assistance: Guam provides quarterly reports to RMS demonstrating progress towards addressing the Special Conditions.  
  
Additionally, to address the uncorrected identified noncompliance and to improve results performance, Guam Part B availed itself of the technical assistance and resources from the following OSEP-funded technical assistance centers such as the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), the National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO), the National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSY), the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT), the Workforce Innovation Technical Assistance Center (WINTAC), and the Partner Support Center (PSC) for the required IDEA 618 data submissions to EDEN/EDFacts; and through the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities, Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS).  
  
In October 2020, GDOE was awarded an OSEP State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG): Project Hita Para Mo'na to support its system's professional development improvements, especially during these uncertain times and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Technical assistance for the implementation of Project Hita Para Mo'na is through the partnership established with one of Guam's local parent orgranization, Autism Community Together (ACT); Guam's higher education technical assistance provider and preservice program, University of Guam CEDDERS and School of Education; and the national special education leadership organization, the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE).   
  
OSEP: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Guam did not provide any data for Indicator 17. Guam must provide the required data for FFY 2020 in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.  
  
Guam RESPONSE: Guam Part B has provided the required data for Indicator 17 in this FFY 2020 submission of the SPP/APR.  
  
OSEP: OSEP notes that Guam submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 508). However, one or more of the Indicator 17 attachments included in the Guam's FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the US Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, Guam must make the attachments available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the Determination Letter.  
  
Guam RESPONSE: The FFY 2019 SPP/APR posted on the GDOE Division of Special Education's webpage is 508 Compliant. For this FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, Guam Part B ensures that any attachments will comply and meet the requirements of Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1073, as amended (Section 508).

## Intro - OSEP Response

Guam's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed Guam that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance. Guam provided the required information.  
  
The Department has imposed Specific Conditions on Guam's IDEA Part B grant awards for the last three or more years.

## Intro - Required Actions

Guam's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In Guam's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised Guam of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required Guam to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed Guam to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. Guam must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

**Measurement**

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 85.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 82.00% | 83.00% | 84.00% | 85.00% | 86.00% |
| Data | 82.52% | 90.76% | 85.42% | 85.81% | 83.33% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 85.00% | 86.00% | 87.00% | 88.00% | 89.00% | 90.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information from stakeholder sessions:  
  
Additionally, during focus group and stakeholder sessions, Guam Part B presented performance data using the new methodology of calculating the percentage of Exiters who graduated starting from FFY 2016 through FFY 2020. Reviewing five years’ worth of data using the new calculations and making the comparisons between the previous calculations with the newer calculations helped with setting the targets.   
  
Using the percentage from the new methodology for calculating Indicator 1, and together with its stakeholders, Guam determined that FFY 2020 will reflect a revised baseline and new targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 based on the new methodology. The stakeholders involved in the discussions included personnel from the Division’s Secondary Transition Office, case managers from the high schools, administrators who oversee the delivery of services of students with IEPs at their schools, and parents who attended the large group stakeholder sessions, inclusive of parents from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 102 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 1 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 17 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 102 | 120 | 83.33% | 85.00% | 85.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

GDOE Board Policy #351.4 (11/27/00) states that a graduate must have a minimum of 24 credits for a high school diploma from a Guam public high school. The Exiting section of the Handbook for the Delivery of Special Education Services states that graduates are students who meet the same standards for graduation as students without disabilities. Although there is no GDOE Board Policy governing the requirements for students with disabilities attending private schools, all private school students must graduate with a minimum of 24 credits in order to receive a high school diploma from the private school they are attending.

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Beginning FFY 2020, Guam Part B revised its methodology of calculating the data for Indicator 1 to keep in line with the measurements and calculations described in the Part B SPP and APR Measurement Table and the requirement of the one year data lag. It should be noted that Guam Part B used the prepopulated 618 exit data for students who graduated in SY2019-2020 for this FFY 2020.   
  
In previous SPP/APR submissions and using the one year data lag, Guam Part B reported Indicator 1 performance data utilizing the cohort calculation employed by the Guam Department of Education (GDOE) to arrive at a graduation rate or cohort rate. With the new methodology of calculating performance for Indicator 1 and using the one year data lag, Guam Part B will be reporting on the percentage of Exiters who had graduated with a high school diploma beginning FFY 2020.   
  
As such, the data and targets reported in this SPP/APR reflect the revised Indicator 1 baseline data for FFY 2020 and targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025.  
  
COVID-19 Impact:  
Although COVID-19 might have impacted the level and type of services being delivered such as online versus in-person or Face-To-Face (FTF), the IEP Teams continued to provide, as much as possible, appropriate supports for students with an IEP to stay in school.

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

Guam has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data[[1]](#footnote-2)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 14.17% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 3.75% | 3.50% | 3.25% | 1.19% | 1.15% |
| Data | 1.97% | 3.24% | 3.62% | 3.58% | 2.50% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 14.17% | 14.00% | 13.50% | 13.00% | 12.50% | 12.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information from Stakeholder sessions:  
  
Additionally, during focus group and stakeholder sessions, Guam Part B presented performance data using the new methodology of calculating the percentage of Exiters who dropped out starting from FFY 2016 through FFY 2020. Reviewing five years’ worth of data using the new calculations and making the comparisons between the previous calculations with the newer calculations helped with setting the targets.   
  
Using the percentage from the new methodology for calculating Indicator 2, and together with its stakeholders, Guam determined that FFY 2020 will reflect a revised baseline and new targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 based on the new methodology. The stakeholders involved in the discussions included personnel from the Division’s Secondary Transition Office, case managers from the high schools, administrators who oversee the delivery of services of students with IEPs at their schools, and parents who attended the large group stakeholder sessions, inclusive of parents from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 102 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 1 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 17 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 17 | 120 | 2.50% | 14.17% | 14.17% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

GDOE Board Policy 375: Definition of Dropout states the following:  
  
Definition: A dropout is a person who was enrolled in a GDOE high school sometime during a given year; and after enrollment, stopped attending school without having been transferred to another school or to a high school equivalency education program recognized by the department; or incapacitated to the extent that enrollment in school or participation in an alternative high school program was possible; or graduated from high school or completed an alternative high school program recognized by the Department, within six years of the first day of enrollment in 9th grade; or expelled; or removed by law enforcement authorities and confined, thereby prohibiting the continuation of schooling.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Beginning FFY 2020, Guam Part B revised its methodology of calculating the data for Indicator 2 to keep in line with the measurements and calculations described in the Part B SPP and APR Measurement Table and the requirement of the one year data lag. With stakeholder input, Guam Part B chose to start reporting Option 1 for calculating data for Indicator 2 for FFY 2020 rather than wait until FFY 2021 for the change in methodology to take into effect. It should be noted that, consistent with the Option 1 reporting requirements, Guam Part B used the prepopulated 618 exit data for students with IEPs who dropped out in SY2019-2020 for this FFY 2020 Indicator 2.  
  
In previous SPP/APR submissions, Guam Part B reported Indicator 2 performance data through this calculation methodology: The number of students with IEPs who dropped out were divided by the number of students with IEPs in grades 9 through 12. With the new methodology of calculating performance for Indicator 2, along with the one year data lag, Guam Part B will be reporting on the percentage of Exiters who had dropped out beginning the FFY 2020 reporting period.  
  
As such, the data and targets reported in this SPP/APR reflect the revised Indictor 2 baseline data for FFY 2020 and targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025.  
  
COVID-19 Impact:  
Although COVID-19 might have impacted the level and type of services being delivered, such as online versus in-person or Face-To-Face (FTF), the IEP Teams continued to provide, as much as possible, appropriate supports for students with an IEP to stay in school.

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

Guam has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 55.06% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 44.75% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 32.18% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 54.02% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 45.36% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 32.57% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 55.06% | 60.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 90.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 44.75% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 32.18% | 40.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 80.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 54.02% | 60.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 90.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 45.36% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 32.57% | 40.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 80.00% | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information from stakeholder sessions:  
  
During the smaller focus group and large stakeholder sessions, trend data was presented so that participants could see the patterns or changes from year to year for all measurements in Indicator 3A, 3B and 3C. It was also noted that previous performance and proficiency data was an all inclusive percentage instead of individual percentages for the new measurements for Indicator 3, whereby grades 4, 8, and HS are now reported beginning this FFY 2020 SPP/APR.  
  
Parent participants also noted that the participation rate was very low, which also may have caused the low proficiency rate in both Reading and Math for all students, inclusive of students with disabilities. This low performance in participation and proficiency is attributed to the impact of COVID-19 and the cohort schedule employed by GDOE. Students who received in-person learning were the only students tested; thus those tested were the only students who could produce a proficiency score that was at or above proficient.   
  
To determine the targets, the stakeholders reviewed past performance of all students beginning FFY 2016 through FFY 2018. There was no data to report for FFY 2019. Since it was also noted that the data for FFY 2020 may not be complete because of the impact of COVID-19, stakeholders continued to determine targets, but also reserved the option to review and revise these targets for the next SPP/APR reporting period.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 89 | 181 | 174 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 44 | 66 | 53 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 5 | 13 | 0 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 87 | 183 | 175 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 42 | 68 | 54 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 5 | 13 | 0 |

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 49 | 89 |  | 55.06% | 55.06% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 81 | 181 |  | 44.75% | 44.75% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 56 | 174 |  | 32.18% | 32.18% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 47 | 87 |  | 54.02% | 54.02% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 83 | 183 |  | 45.36% | 45.36% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 57 | 175 |  | 32.57% | 32.57% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

The links listed below are where public reports of assessment results are located in the GDOE website. The first link is for the Annual State of Public Education Report (ASPER). The second link is for the individual school report cards.  
  
(1) https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/8-Research-Planning-and-Evaluation/Portal/annual-state-of-public-education-report  
  
(2) https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education/1868-SPED-School-Report-Cards.html

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The data reported in FFY 2020 will be the new baseline and targets due to the following: In previous SPP/APRs, Guam Part B, together with its stakeholders determined baseline and targets based on data reported for grades 3-8 and HS in both Reading and Math. Individual baseline and targets were not determined for grades 4, 8, and HS in these subject areas. Beginning FFY 2020 through FFY 2025, individual baselines and targets are reported for grades 4, 8 and HS. It is for this reason that stakeholders determined that FFY 2020 will mark the starting year for baseline and targets for Indicator 3A.   
  
Additionally, because of the impact of COVID, stakeholders agreed that the baseline and targets determined for Indicator 3 will be reviewed and possibly revised, as needed, for the following FFY reporting periods due to the following reasons:  
  
For FFY 2020, the data reported on the performance for Indicator 3A was impacted by COVID-19:  
(1) The assessment data reported for Indicator 3A is not complete as not all students had the opportunity to participate in the ACT Aspire. Students who were receiving their education in-person were the students that participated in the assessment. All other students who were receiving their education through online learning or hard copy curriculum did not participate in the ACT Aspire. GDOE was also operating on an A/B Cohort Schedule which made it difficult for students to complete their assessments given the timeframe allocated for assessment administration. Because of this, it would be difficult to gauge as to whether or not the data reported was complete.   
  
(2) It was challenging to collect data on the participation of students with IEPs because there were students who were receiving their education online or through hard copy curriculum. Attempts were made by the schools to have these students come into their campuses to participate in the ACT Aspire; not all students, however, took advantage of the opportunity.  
  
(3) Beginning November 29, 2021, the GDOE public schools opened its doors for in-person learning 5 days a week instead of an A/B Cohort Schedule. It is through this that participation data for FFY 2021 will show improvement.  
  
Furthermore, the assessment tool that is currently utilized (ACT Aspire) will no longer be in use in Spring 2023. Spring 2022 will be the last year that the ACT Aspire will be administered. Beginning SY2022-2023, Smarter Balanced will be the summative assessment tool that will be utilized.

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

Guam has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.   
  
Guam provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps Guam has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 3A - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | \*[[2]](#footnote-3)1 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | \*[[3]](#footnote-4)1 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | \*[[4]](#footnote-5)1 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | \*[[5]](#footnote-6)1 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | \*[[6]](#footnote-7)1 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | \*[[7]](#footnote-8)1 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | \*[[8]](#footnote-9)1 | 3.00% | 5.00% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | \*[[9]](#footnote-10)1 | 3.00% | 5.00% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | \*[[10]](#footnote-11)1 | 3.00% | 5.00% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | \*[[11]](#footnote-12)1 | 3.00% | 5.00% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | \*[[12]](#footnote-13)1 | 3.00% | 5.00% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | \*[[13]](#footnote-14)1 | 3.00% | 5.00% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information from stakeholder sessions:  
  
During the smaller focus group and large stakeholder sessions, trend data was presented so that participants could see the patterns or changes from year to year for all measurements in Indicator 3A, 3B and 3C. It was also noted that previous performance and proficiency data was an all inclusive percentage instead of individual percentages for the new measurements for Indicator 3, whereby grades 4, 8, and HS are now reported beginning this FFY 2020 SPP/APR.  
  
Parent participants also noted that the participation rate was very low, which also may have caused the low proficiency rate in both Reading and Math for all students, inclusive of students with disabilities. This low performance in participation and proficiency is attributed to the impact of COVID-19 and the cohort schedule employed by GDOE. Students who received in-person learning were the only students tested; thus those tested were the only students who could produce a proficiency score that was at or above proficient.   
  
To determine the targets, the stakeholders reviewed past performance of all students beginning FFY 2016 through FFY 2018. There was no data to report for FFY 2019. Since it was also noted that the data for FFY 2020 may not be complete because of the impact of COVID-19, stakeholders continued to determine targets, but also reserved the option to review and revise these targets for the next SPP/APR reporting period.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 44 | 68 | 56 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[14]](#footnote-15)1 | \*[[15]](#footnote-16)1 | \*[[16]](#footnote-17)1 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[17]](#footnote-18)1 | \*[[18]](#footnote-19)1 | \*[[19]](#footnote-20)1 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 42 | 70 | 57 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[20]](#footnote-21)1 | \*[[21]](#footnote-22)1 | \*[[22]](#footnote-23)1 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[23]](#footnote-24)1 | \*[[24]](#footnote-25)1 | \*[[25]](#footnote-26)1 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | \*[[26]](#footnote-27)1 | 44 |  | \*[[27]](#footnote-28)1 | \*[[28]](#footnote-29)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | \*[[29]](#footnote-30)1 | 68 |  | \*[[30]](#footnote-31)1 | \*[[31]](#footnote-32)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | \*[[32]](#footnote-33)1 | 56 |  | \*[[33]](#footnote-34)1 | \*[[34]](#footnote-35)1 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | \*[[35]](#footnote-36)1 | 42 |  | \*[[36]](#footnote-37)1 | \*[[37]](#footnote-38)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | \*[[38]](#footnote-39)1 | 70 |  | \*[[39]](#footnote-40)1 | \*[[40]](#footnote-41)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | \*[[41]](#footnote-42)1 | 57 |  | \*[[42]](#footnote-43)1 | \*[[43]](#footnote-44)1 | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

The links listed below are where public reports of assessment results are located in the GDOE website. The first link is for the Annual State of Public Education Report (ASPER). The second link is for the individual school report cards.  
  
(1) https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/8-Research-Planning-and-Evaluation/Portal/annual-state-of-public-education-report  
  
(2) https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education/1868-SPED-School-Report-Cards.html

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The data reported in FFY 2020 will be the new baseline and targets due to the following: In previous SPP/APRs, Guam Part B, together with its stakeholders determined baseline and targets based on data reported for grades 3-8 and HS in both Reading and Math. Individual baseline and targets were not determined for grades 4, 8, and HS in these subject areas. Beginning FFY 2020 through FFY 2025, individual baselines and targets are reported for grades 4, 8 and HS. It is for this reason that stakeholders determined that FFY 2020 will mark the starting year for baseline and targets for Indicator 3B.   
  
Additionally, because of the impact of COVID, stakeholders agreed that the baseline and targets determined for Indicator 3 will be reviewed and possibly revised, as needed, for the following FFY reporting period due to the following reasons:  
  
For FFY 2020, the data reported on the performance for Indicator 3B was impacted by COVID-19:  
(1) The assessment data reported for Indicator 3B is not complete as not all students had the opportunity to participate in the ACT Aspire, and therefore, could not produce a valid score and proficiency level at or above proficient again grade level. Students who were receiving their education in-person were the students who participated in the assessment. All other students who were receiving their education through online learning or hard copy curriculum did not participate in the ACT Aspire. GDOE was also operating on an A/B Cohort Schedule which made it difficult for students to complete their assessments given the timeframe allocated for assessment administration. Because of this, it would be difficult to gauge as to whether or not the data reported is complete.   
  
(2) It was challenging to collect data on the participation and proficiency of students with IEPs because there were students who were receiving their education online or through hard copy curriculum. Attempts were made by the schools to have these students come into their campuses to participate in the ACT Aspire; not all students, however, took advantage of the opportunity.  
  
(3) Beginning November 29, 2021, the GDOE public schools opened its doors for in-person learning 5 days a week instead of an A/B Cohort Schedule. It is through this that assessment data for FFY 2021 will show some improvement.  
  
Furthermore, the assessment tool that is currently utilized (ACT Aspire) will no longer be in use in Spring 2023. Spring 2022 will be the last year that the ACT Aspire will be administered. Beginning SY2022-2023, Smarter Balanced will be the summative assessment tool that will be utilized.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

Guam has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.   
  
Guam provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps Guam has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time

of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | \*[[44]](#footnote-45)1 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | \*[[45]](#footnote-46)1 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS |  |  |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | \*[[46]](#footnote-47)1 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | \*[[47]](#footnote-48)1 |
| Math | C | Grade HS |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | \*[[48]](#footnote-49)1 | 2.00% | 3.00% | 4.00% | 5.00% | 6.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | \*[[49]](#footnote-50)1 | 8.00% | 8.50% | 9.00% | 9.50% | 10.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | \*[[50]](#footnote-51)1 | 11.00% | 12.00% | 13.00% | 14.00% | 21.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | \*[[51]](#footnote-52)1 | 11.00% | 12.00% | 13.00% | 14.00% | 39.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information from stakeholder sessions:  
  
During the smaller focus group and large stakeholder sessions, trend data was presented so that participants could see the patterns or changes from year to year for all measurements in Indicator 3A, 3B and 3C. It was also noted that previous performance and proficiency data was an all inclusive percentage instead of individual percentages for the new measurements for Indicator 3, whereby grades 4, 8, and HS are now reported beginning this FFY 2020 SPP/APR.  
  
Parent participants also noted that the participation rate was very low, which also may have caused the low proficiency rate in both Reading and Math for all students, inclusive of students with disabilities. This low performance in participation and proficiency is attributed to the impact of COVID-19 and the cohort schedule employed by GDOE. Students who received in-person learning were the only students tested; thus those tested were the only students who could produce a proficiency score that was at or above proficient.   
  
To determine the targets, the stakeholders reviewed past performance of all students beginning FFY 2016 through FFY 2018. There was no data to report for FFY 2019. Since it was also noted that the data for FFY 2020 may not be complete because of the impact of COVID-19, stakeholders continued to determine targets, but also reserved the option to review and revise these targets for the next SPP/APR reporting period.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 5 | 13 | 0 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | \*[[52]](#footnote-53)1 | \*[[53]](#footnote-54)1 | \*[[54]](#footnote-55)1 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 5 | 13 | 0 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | \*[[55]](#footnote-56)1 | 5 | \*[[56]](#footnote-57)1 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | \*[[57]](#footnote-58)1 | 5 |  | \*[[58]](#footnote-59)1 | \*[[59]](#footnote-60)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | \*[[60]](#footnote-61)1 | 13 |  | \*[[61]](#footnote-62)1 | \*[[62]](#footnote-63)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | \*[[63]](#footnote-64)1 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | \*[[64]](#footnote-65)1 | 5 |  | \*[[65]](#footnote-66)1 | \*[[66]](#footnote-67)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 5 | 13 |  | \*[[67]](#footnote-68)1 | 38.46% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | \*[[68]](#footnote-69)1 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

The links listed below are where public reports of assessment results are located in the GDOE website. The first link is for the Annual State of Public Education Report (ASPER). The second link is for the individual school report cards.  
  
(1) https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/8-Research-Planning-and-Evaluation/Portal/annual-state-of-public-education-report  
  
(2) https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education/1868-SPED-School-Report-Cards.html

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The data reported in FFY 2020 3C for 4th grade and 8th grade will be the new baseline and targets due to the following: In previous SPP/APRs, Guam Part B, together with its stakeholders, determined baseline and targets based on data reported for grades 3-8 and HS in both Reading and Math. In previous years, individual baseline and targets were not determined for grades 4, 8, and HS in these subject areas. Beginning FFY 2020 through FFY 2025, individual baseline and targets have been determined for grades 4 and 8. However, for HS, there were no HS students who required an AA-AAAS in FFY 2020. Guam Part B therefore could not determine baseline in FFY 2020 and targets for the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 reporting years. It is for this reason that stakeholders determined that FFY 2020 would mark the starting year for baseline and FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets for Indicator 3C for 4th grade and 8th grade, and FFY 2021 3C data for HS would serve as baseline for that grade with targets to be established for FFY 2021 - FFY 2025.   
  
A consideration to select a previous year's performance for HS to set the baseline was discussed with stakeholders. However, with the impact of COVID-19, the last statewide assessment conducted was in Spring 2019 (FFY 2018). There was no state-wide assessment conducted in Spring 2020 (FFY 2019) due to school closures as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. At this time, utilizing performance data from two years ago and prior to the COVID-19 impact would not be a reasonable measure of performance for baseline. Stakeholders therefore recommended waiting until FFY 2021 to establish baseline and determine FFY 2021 - FFY 2025 targets for 3C HS.  
  
For FFY 2020, the data reported on the performance for Indicator 3C was impacted by COVID-19:  
(1) The assessment data reported for Indicator 3C is not complete as not all students had the opportunity to participate in the alternate assessment. Students who were receiving their education in-person were the students who participated in the alternate assessment. All other students who were receiving their education through online learning or hard copy curriculum did not participate in the alternate assessment. GDOE was also operating on an A/B Cohort Schedule which made it difficult for students to complete their assessments given the timeframe allocated for alternate assessment administration. Because of this, it would be difficult to gauge as to whether or not the data reported is complete.   
  
(2) It was challenging to collect data on the participation and performance of students with IEPs because there were students who were receiving their education online or through hard copy curriculum. Attempts were made by the schools to have these students come into their campuses to participate in the assessment; not all students, however, took advantage of the opportunity.  
  
(3) Beginning November 29, 2021, the GDOE public schools opened its doors for in-person learning 5 days a week instead of an A/B Cohort Schedule. It is through this that assessment data for FFY 2021 will show some improvement.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

Guam provided baseline data for 4th and 8th grade Reading and 4th and 8th grade Math under this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts those baselines.  
  
Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for 4th and 8th grade Reading and Math under this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.   
  
Guam provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for High School Math and Reading, and steps Guam has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 3C - Required Actions

The State did not provide baseline and targets for HS Reading and Math. The State must provide the baseline and required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

# Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 12.38 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 16.57 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 6.68 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 3.79 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 2.10 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | -0.53 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 12.38 | 12.00 | 11.50 | 11.00 | 10.50 | 10.00 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 16.57 | 16.00 | 15.50 | 15.00 | 14.50 | 14.00 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 6.68 | 6.40 | 6.20 | 6.00 | 5.80 | 5.60 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 3.79 | 3.60 | 3.40 | 3.20 | 3.00 | 2.80 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 2.10 | 1.85 | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.00 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 0.00 | 1.88 | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.25 | 0.00 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information from stakeholder sessions:  
  
Parent participants in the stakeholder group agreed that because Indicator 3D is a new Indicator, they would defer to the guidance from Guam Part B personnel to propose acceptable targets. With this in mind, Guam Part B is noting the following:  
  
The Guam Department of Education (GDOE) does not report student assessment data to USEd. It was therefore challenging to retrieve data for students without disabilities who participated in the summative assessment and received a proficiency score that was at or above proficient. As such, trend data or growth or change data was not available so that comparisons could be made between students with IEPs and nondisabled students from year to year.  
  
To determine targets for Indicator 3D, Guam Part B proposed to start with the end goal and work backwards. Parent stakeholders agreed to use this method to develop targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025, with the caveat that targets for subsequent FFY SPP/APRs may be reviewed and revised, as needed.  
  
Moreover, because GDOE will be changing its summative assessment tool from the ACT Aspire to Smarter Balanced by SY2022-2023, stakeholders agreed there is the likelihood that baselines and targets for 3D will be reviewed, and possibly revised, within two years.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 840 | 665 | 496 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 44 | 68 | 56 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[69]](#footnote-70)1 | \*[[70]](#footnote-71)1 | \*[[71]](#footnote-72)1 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[72]](#footnote-73)1 | \*[[73]](#footnote-74)1 | \*[[74]](#footnote-75)1 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[75]](#footnote-76)1 | \*[[76]](#footnote-77)1 | \*[[77]](#footnote-78)1 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[78]](#footnote-79)1 | \*[[79]](#footnote-80)1 | \*[[80]](#footnote-81)1 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 844 | 666 | 492 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 42 | 70 | 57 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[81]](#footnote-82)1 | \*[[82]](#footnote-83)1 | \*[[83]](#footnote-84)1 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[84]](#footnote-85)1 | \*[[85]](#footnote-86)1 | \*[[86]](#footnote-87)1 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[87]](#footnote-88)1 | \*[[88]](#footnote-89)1 | \*[[89]](#footnote-90)1 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[90]](#footnote-91)1 | \*[[91]](#footnote-92)1 | \*[[92]](#footnote-93)1 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | \*[[93]](#footnote-94)1 | \*[[94]](#footnote-95)1 |  | 12.38 | 12.38 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | \*[[95]](#footnote-96)1 | \*[[96]](#footnote-97)1 |  | 16.57 | 16.57 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | \*[[97]](#footnote-98)1 | \*[[98]](#footnote-99)1 |  | 6.68 | 6.68 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | \*[[99]](#footnote-100)1 | \*[[100]](#footnote-101)1 |  | 3.79 | 3.79 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | \*[[101]](#footnote-102)1 | \*[[102]](#footnote-103)1 |  | 2.10 | 2.10 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | \*[[103]](#footnote-104)1 | \*[[104]](#footnote-105)1 |  | 0.00 | -0.53 | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The FFY 2020 baseline data for 3D HS is -0.53. However, the EMAPS system requires a "value" that is equal to or greater than "0" in the data fields. Therefore, the FFY 2020 baseline and target reflected in this indicator for 3D HS had to be a "0" and not the FFY 2020 data of -0.53. In addition, the FFY 2025 target had to be set at "0" which is the same data for the FFY 2020 baseline. Guam Part B will revisit the 3D HS data in FFY 2021 to determine if the baseline needs to be re-established and targets for FFY 2021 - FFY 2025 revised.  
  
During Spring 2021 when the summative assessments were administered, students with IEPs who were receiving their education in-person were the only students who participated in the assessment and were able to produce a proficiency score at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards. The same premise held for all students without disabilities. It is for this reason that the percentages reported in 3D do not accurately reflect the student population enrolled in the GDOE schools who would have participated in the summative assessment.   
  
Additionally, students were attending school using an A/B cohort schedule and received in-person or online instruction at least 2 or 3 times per week. It was not until November 29, 2021 that GDOE returned to in person and online learning 5 days a week. It is anticipated that there will be more students who will be able to participate in the summative assessments that will be administered in Spring 2022, which would yield a truer reflection of the participation rate in the summative assessment whereby complete scores that represent proficiency at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards could be reported.  
  
Furthermore, Spring 2022 will be the last year that the ACT Aspire will be administered. Beginning Spring 2023, GDOE will be administering Smarter Balanced as the summative assessment to its student population. There is the strong likelihood that the baseline and targets for 3D will be reviewed, and possibly revised, as needed.

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

Guam has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.  
  
Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.   
  
In addition, OSEP notes that Guam's end target for FFY 2025 does not reflect improvement over Guam's FFY 2020 baseline data for High School Math, because the FFY 2020 data was impacted by COVID-19. Specifically, Guam reported that, "during Spring 2021 when the summative assessments were administered, students with IEPs who were receiving their education in-person were the only students who participated in the assessment."   
  
Guam provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps Guam has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 3D - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Guam will need to revise its baseline year for this indicator in High School Math in order to ensure comparability of baseline data and target data. Guam may also need to revise its FFY 2025 target for High School Math accordingly, to reflect improvement over the revised baseline data.

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information from stakeholder sessions:  
  
Stakeholders reviewed drill down data on the types of incidences that occurred during SY2019-2020 to determine the reasons for the suspensions/expulsion that were greater than 10 days for students with IEPs. Upon review of the data, It was noted that there were several riots at the start of SY2019-2020 that involved students with IEPs. These riots occurred in 3 of the 6 high schools. Students with and with IEPs were suspended for greater than 10 days as a result of the riots.  
  
Parent stakeholders took note that for the incidences that occurred where students with IEPs were removed for greater than 10 days, school personnel charged with overseeing discipline followed the policies, procedures and practices for Manifestation Determinations. Manifestation Determination Meetings were held for each student and decisions were made based on the results of the Manifestation Determination Meetings. Parent stakeholders were assured that this process is followed diligently; and that updated training was held on January 21, 2022 with School Administrators and Case Managers, especially at the Secondary level where a majority of the disciplinary incidences occur.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

NO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs in the State** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 1 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

Guam's definition of "significant discrepancy": GDOE is a unitary system and does not have local education agencies (LEAs). Guam's method of determining whether there were significant discrepancies occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities was done by comparing the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities to the rate for non-disabled children. In FFY 2008, Guam's definition for "significant discrepancy" was revised as follows: Significant discrepancy is determined when children with disabilities have long term suspension and expulsion at a rate three times that of children without disabilities.  
  
METHODOLOGY  
  
The enrollment data for students with disabilities on September 30th for SY 2019-2020 was 1,854 students. The enrollment data for students without disabilities for SY2019-2020 was 26,958.  
  
In SY 2019-2020, the number of long-term suspensions or expulsions for students with disabilities was 145 students based on the IDEA 618 discipline reported data; the number of long term suspensions or expulsions for students without disabilities was 939 based on the GDOE student data system.  
  
For this reporting year and using SY 2019-2020 data described above, 7.82% (145/1854) of students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days. For students without disabilities, 3.48% (939/26,958) were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days.  
  
Using Guam's definition of "significant discrepancy" whereby significant discrepancy is determined when children with disabilities have long term suspension and expulsion at a rate three times that of children without disabilities, children with disabilities were suspended or expelled at 7.82%, as opposed to 3.48% of children without disabilities. This indicates that children with disabilities were suspended 4.34% more than children without disabilities. This difference does not reach the threshold of three times more than children without disabilities definition for significant discrepancy, in which long-term suspension/expulsion data for children with disabilities would have had to be 10.44% (3.48% x 3).  
  
Based on this performance and Guam's definition of "significant discrepancy," Guam met the target for Indicator 4A for this FFY APR reporting period using the one-year lag data.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Per Indicator 4A Measurement Instructions, if a "significant discrepancy" occurs, Guam must review and, if appropriate, revise its policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.  
  
For FFY 2020, Guam did not report a "significant discrepancy." Thus, for FFY 2020, Guam did not identify any noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR Section 300.170(b).

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:**

Per OSEP instructions, Indicator 4B is not applicable to Guam.

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 48.00% | 50.00% |  | 44.50% | 44.55% |
| A | 42.06% | Data | 46.88% | 45.47% | 44.21% | 44.72% | 41.27% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 11.00% | 10.00% |  | 3.50% | 3.45% |
| B | 3.89% | Data | 6.02% | 4.89% | 3.79% | 2.75% | 2.75% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 1.50% | 1.50% |  | 0.10% | 0.09% |
| C | 0.12% | Data | 0.06% | 0.06% | 0.11% | 0.17% | 0.12% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 42.06% | 43.00% | 43.50% | 44.00% | 44.50% | 45.00% |
| Target B <= | 3.89% | 3.75% | 3.75% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.25% |
| Target C <= | 0.12% | 0.10% | 0.10% | 0.09% | 0.09% | 0.05% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information during stakeholder sessions:  
  
During the small focus group sessions with case managers and resource room teachers, a discussion was held surrounding the determination of the Least Restrictive Environment or LRE for students with disabilities. These stakeholders agreed that students with IEPs need to be receiving the majority of their core instruction in reading and math with their same age peers in the general education classroom. As students with IEPs move upward towards middle school and high school, these stakeholders noted that students with IEPs tend to be receiving some of their core instruction in a resource room. The majority of stakeholders agreed that support to their general education colleagues needs is crucial to the success students with IEPs, especially in middle school and high school.  
  
A comment from a parent member during one of the large stakeholder sessions intimated that finding a general education teacher who is willing to take on children with IEPs in their general education classroom was the reason for her children's success in a middle school Social Studies class. This parent noted that working alongside the general education teacher and school personnel to ensure her children received the supports needed attributed to a meaningful school year. Other parent participants at the virtual large stakeholder session agreed that if general education teachers provided the appropriate accommodations and supports in their general education classrooms, children with IEPs will have successful experiences in the LRE selected for their children.  
  
Because Indicator 5 is calculated differently beginning FFY 2020, whereby 5 year old children enrolled in Kindergarten are added to the equation, 5 years' worth of data was presented beginning from FFY 2016 through FFY 2020 and compared with the performances using the older calculations. Stakeholders noted that there was not much difference with the added numbers of 5 year old Kindergarten children with IEPs.  
  
After much discussion and with stakeholder input, Guam Part B determined that the FFY 2020 SPP/APR will reflect new baseline and targets for Indicator 5 because of the revised measurements which includes 5 year old students with IEPs enrolled in Kindergarten. Thus, beginning FFY 2020, a new baseline was established and targets were determined for each measurement in Indicator 5 for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 1,695 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 713 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 66 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 2 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 713 | 1,695 | 41.27% | 42.06% | 42.06% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 66 | 1,695 | 2.75% | 3.89% | 3.89% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 2 | 1,695 | 0.12% | 0.12% | 0.12% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact:  
  
Although COVID might have impacted the level and type of services being delivered such as online and in-person or Face-To-Face (FTF), the IEP Teams continued to determine the appropriate LRE for each child with an IEP.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

Guam has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **A** | Target >= | 60.00% | 62.00% | 64.00% | 66.00% | 66.50% |
| **A** | Data | 54.72% | 61.21% | 63.47% | 52.35% | 60.81% |
| **B** | Target <= | 11.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% | 9.00% | 8.50% |
| **B** | Data | 11.32% | 13.94% | 5.39% | 11.41% | 20.27% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information from stakeholder sessions:  
  
During a large stakeholder session, parents noted that there should be more options available for young children to participate in the regular early childhood programs offered by the Guam Department of Education. Currently, there are 50 available slots for children with disabilities for the Head Start Program, which is approximately 10% of the Head Start Population. There are also four pre-Kindergarten classrooms located in four different GDOE Public Schools throughout the island.  
  
Parent stakeholders noted that many of the parents of children in this age bracket prefer the safety of smaller numbers and rely heavily on the regional preschool classrooms available to eligible children. There are currently three (3) regional classrooms for young children with IEPs in the early childhood program. This notation may attribute to the number of young children reported in 6B  
  
Parent stakeholders also felt that the Home setting is a natural environment for young children because of the many extended families and family members who live near or with other family members. These extended families have several young children between the ages of 3 through 5 years old. Parent stakeholders commented that consideration be made to classify the Home Setting as a natural environment whereby targets should increase instead of decrease.  
  
Because Indicator 6 is a calculated differently beginning FFY 2020, whereby 5 year old Kindergarten children with IEPs were removed from the equation, five (5) years worth of data was presented to stakeholders in order to make decisions about target setting. Data from FFY 2016 through FFY 2020 was presented, using the new calculations and was compared with the performances in the same FFYs with the previous calculations. Stakeholders noted that Indicator 6A was impacted because of the removal of the 5 year old Kindergarten students with IEPs.   
  
Using this information and with stakeholder input, Guam Part B determined that the FFY 2020 SPP/APR will reflect new baseline and targets for Indicator 6 because of the revised measurements which excludes 5 year old children with IEPs enrolled in Kindergarten. Thus, new baseline and targets were determined for Indicator 6A and 6B for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025.   
  
Indicator 6C is a new measurement. Therefore, FFY 2020 data for children aged 3-5 with IEPs receiving services in the HOME environment, reflects new baseline. Using the baseline data for Indicator 6C, stakeholders also determined targets for 6C for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025.

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | 2020 | 38.64% |
| **B** | 2020 | 18.18% |
| **C** | 2020 | 43.18% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 38.64% | 39.00% | 42.00% | 45.00% | 48.00% | 51.00% |
| Target B <= | 18.18% | 18.00% | 17.50% | 17.00% | 16.50% | 16.00% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 43.18% | 42.00% | 41.00% | 40.00% | 39.00% | 38.00% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 29 | 38 | 21 | 88 |
| a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 3 | 23 | 8 | 34 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 2 | 6 | 8 | 16 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 24 | 9 | 5 | 38 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 34 | 88 | 60.81% | 38.64% | 38.64% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 16 | 88 | 20.27% | 18.18% | 18.18% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Home | 38 | 88 |  | 43.18% | 43.18% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact:  
School closure, social distancing, and wearing face masks required special education services to be adjusted from Face-To-Face (FTF) to distance learning. This limited the intensity and frequency of interactions with preschoolers with an IEP during the reporting period. GDOE opened its doors to 5 days a week of instruction beginning November 29, 2021. With this move, Guam Part B is hopeful that the intensity and frequency of interactions of preschoolers with an IEP will increase.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

Guam has revised the baseline for 6A and 6B for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.   
  
Guam has established the baseline for 6C for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.  
  
Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1**: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2**: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.50% | 85.50% | 85.50% |
| A1 | 71.00% | Data | 74.14% | 76.92% | 70.18% | 83.58% | 79.31% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 39.00% | 39.00% | 57.50% | 57.51% | 57.51% |
| A2 | 57.50% | Data | 31.67% | 21.21% | 29.51% | 23.53% | 15.52% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 85.50% | 85.50% | 86.00% | 86.00% | 86.00% |
| B1 | 80.00% | Data | 79.31% | 80.00% | 75.00% | 88.24% | 75.86% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 34.00% | 34.00% | 47.50% | 47.51% | 47.51% |
| B2 | 47.50% | Data | 30.00% | 16.67% | 27.87% | 20.59% | 13.79% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 89.31% | 89.32% | 89.32% |
| C1 | 89.30% | Data | 79.31% | 75.00% | 59.65% | 80.60% | 78.95% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 40.00% | 40.00% | 70.00% | 70.01% | 70.01% |
| C2 | 70.00% | Data | 40.00% | 30.30% | 32.79% | 25.00% | 20.69% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 70.00% | 70.40% | 70.80% | 80.00% | 80.25% | 80.50% |
| Target A2 >= | 21.28% | 30.00% | 35.00% | 40.00% | 45.00% | 58.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 80.00% | 80.40% | 80.80% | 90.20% | 90.40% | 90.80% |
| Target B2 >= | 6.38% | 7.00% | 10.00% | 15.00% | 20.00% | 48.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 89.00% | 89.50% | 90.00% | 90.50% | 91.00% | 91.50% |
| Target C2 >= | 21.28% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 71.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information from stakeholder sessions:  
  
Several focus group sessions were held with stakeholders, which included the early childhood special education teachers, Head Start teachers, and service provides, to review the ECO data for the preschool children reported in Indicator 7 for this fiscal year. Special attention was given to the performance of the preschool children in Summary Statement 1 (SS1) in all measurements. These sessions were held on the following dates:  
 - August 31, 2021  
- October 31, 2021  
- December 14, 2021  
- January 3, 2022  
- January 6, 2022  
  
Additional sessions were held with parents during the large stakeholder sessions conducted in person and virtually which were held on January 8, 2022 and January 11, 2022.  
  
During these focus group and large stakeholder sessions, there was much discussion centered around the high performances of SS1 in Measurements 7A, 7B, and 7C. Stakeholders were wondering if the data was a true reflection of student performance during this reporting period given the impact of COVID-19. Participants agreed that one factor which may have attributed to the high performance was that students with developmental delays did well after receiving the interventions and strategies implemented. Parents, together, with the teachers and service providers worked extremely hard to deliver quality services to these children despite the setbacks from COVID. Another factor considered was that the performance for this FFY 2020 could have been an anomaly.   
  
National performance data for Indicator 7, SS1 in Measurements A, B, and C were also reviewed. After much discussion and review of the national data, along with the noted drop in the performance in SS1 throughout the years. Guam Part B stakeholders decided to be conservative in its determination of targets for Indicator 7 for all measurements and for each of the summary statements in the measurements, keeping in mind that the end target for FFY 2025 needs to be higher than the target established during the baseline year of FFY 2008.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

47

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 4 | 8.51% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 33 | 70.21% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 9 | 19.15% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1 | 2.13% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 42 | 46 | 79.31% | 70.00% | 91.30% | Met target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 10 | 47 | 15.52% | 21.28% | 21.28% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 2 | 4.26% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 42 | 89.36% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3 | 6.38% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 45 | 47 | 75.86% | 80.00% | 95.74% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 3 | 47 | 13.79% | 6.38% | 6.38% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 4 | 8.51% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 33 | 70.21% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 10 | 21.28% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 43 | 47 | 78.95% | 89.00% | 91.49% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 10 | 47 | 20.69% | 21.28% | 21.28% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Guam Part B Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program uses multiple sources of information to determine the status of early childhood outcomes. Most of the information needed is collected as part of the development of the child's Individualized Education Program (IEP); therefore, collecting child assessment information is part of the IEP development process and not an added step.  
  
The following information is considered in determining a child's status relating to the three early childhood outcomes:  
  
The summary information for child outcomes is expected to take into account the child's functioning across a full range of situations and settings. Information from many individuals in contact with the child is considered in deciding the rating for each outcome. These may include, but not be limited to the following: Parents, ECSE Teachers or Head Start Teachers, Child Care Providers (if appropriate), and other Early Childhood Providers (if appropriate).  
  
Many types of information are used in determining the child's status relative to the child outcomes. These may include, but not be limited to: Parent input and observations; Service Provider input and observations; curriculum based assessments such as the Teaching Strategies Gold Creative Curriculum or the Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP); the Guam Early Learning Guidelines; and the child's progress reports from Service Providers.  
  
Information about each outcome is reflected in the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance across typical settings and situations that make up the child's daily routines.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID 19 Impact: From August 2020 through January 2021, special education services were delivered virtually. When GDOE resumed in person learning in January 2021, it was through a cohort schedule. This limited the intensity and frequency of interactions with preschoolers with an IEP during this reporting period. GDOE opened its doors to 5 days of week of instruction beginning November 29, 2021. With this move, Guam hopes that the additional time provided for in-person learning will increase the performance of its preschoolers with IEPs for the next reporting period.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of parents from whom response is requested****is allowed.* *When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information on stakeholder sessions:  
  
Prior to conducting the parent forum sessions, the focus group for this APR period, which represented parent members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), met to discuss and determine the questions that will be posed during the scheduled Parent Forum sessions. The questions that will be posed to parents who attend the forums would elicit responses as to how schools have helped them become involved as a parent to improve the services and results for their child receiving special education services. The parent members of the focus group also agreed that the word "school" would refer to either the school principal, general education teacher, special education teacher, or counselor, etc.   
  
Parent Forum Questions  
As a result of the focus group session, and with input from the parent members of the GAPSD, the questions are as follows:  
  
Question #1: How has your child’s school helped you to prepare for and participate in your child’s IEP meeting?   
Sub-questions:  
- What is your experience with the provision related services as a component of the IEP?  
- What is your experience with the provision of a one-to-one aide as a component of the IEP?  
  
Question#2: How has your child’s school helped you to understand your child’s IEP?   
  
Question #3: How has your child’s school helped you to help your child by providing training and information?   
  
Question #4: How has your child’s school communicated with you in order for you to help your child improve in school?   
  
Question #5: How has your child’s school helped you to understand your parent rights?   
  
Question #6: What was your experience when your child was initially evaluated or reevaluated to determine the initial or continued need for special education and related services? This question is for parents whose child was initially evaluated or reevaluated within the past two years.  
  
Question #7: What has been your experience with your child’s education since the start of COVID-19?  
  
There were two parent forum sessions held:   
- Virtual Session in the evening: January 12, 2022. Four (4) parents attended this session.  
- In-Person Session on a Saturday morning: January 15, 2022. Four (4) parents attended this session.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 62.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 80.00% | 80.00% | 84.00% | 86.00% | 86.50% |
| Data | 86.17% | 92.74% | 71.37% | 72.88% |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 72.00% | 72.00% | 75.00% | 78.00% | 81.00% | 84.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  |  | 72.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

COVID-19 Impact:  
Due to COVID-19 impacting school operations, the parent surveys were not distributed to the schools. Alternative data was gathered to respond to Indicator 8. Guam is not able to provide FFY 2020 Indicator 8 performance to compare its performance to previous year's performance. It must be noted that Guam was also not able to distribute the parent surveys to the schools during FFY 2019.  
  
Alternative data is provided for this APR reporting period since Guam Part B does not have Indicator 8 data to report.  
  
Selection of Participants  
The Division of Special Education generated a list of active students from the total population of eligible students with disabilities beginning with students in preschool through school-age. Students who were pending an evaluation and eligibility determination were not included in the final list.   
  
Format for Notifying Parents of Focus Group Sessions   
In collaboration with the Parent Services Coordinator, it was agreed that parents will be informed of the opportunity to participate in one of two focus group sessions. A flyer was delivered to every student on the school special education roster. Preschool aged children are included in the school rosters at their district school. In addition, the Parent Services Coordinator notified parents with email addresses on record.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

0

**Percentage of respondent parents**

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate |  |  |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

Parent surveys were not distributed during FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. Guam Part B provides alternative data for this reporting FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

**Describe the analysis** **of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

Parent surveys were not distributed during FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. Guam Part B provides alternative data for this reporting FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

**Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.**

Parent surveys were not distributed during FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. Guam Part B provides alternative data for this reporting FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

Parent surveys were not distributed during FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. Guam Part B provides alternative data for this reporting FFY 2020 SPP/APR.  
  
The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in a low participation rate in both the virtual focus group session, as well as the in-person session. The limited communication options employed to inform parents about the focus group sessions may have resulted in the low participation.   
  
Thus, the responses of the parents are limited due to the low number of parents who participated in the sessions.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

Parent surveys were not distributed during FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. Guam Part B provides alternative data for this reporting FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. |  |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Input from Parent Forum Sessions  
  
There were a total of seven questions with the first question having three parts related to the IEP and the provision of related services. Each statement provided by the parents for each of the questions was categorized by themes. As noted previously, the definition of "school "when presenting each question emphasized that "school" may refer to the school administrator, the general education teacher, the special education teacher, or the counselor, etc. A summary of the themes for each of the questions is provided below:  
  
Question #1: How has your child’s school helped you to prepare for and participate in your child’s IEP meeting?  
Themes  
- Majority of the meetings were conducted virtually.   
- Parents were not provided support for accessing the online platform on the internet. Some of the parents indicated they had to access the internet on their phone, which had limited data.  
- Draft documents were received before the meeting.   
- Teachers and other school personnel communicated with parent on an on-going basis.   
  
Sub-question #1:  
What is your experience with the provision related services as a component of the IEP?  
Themes  
- The provision of related services was through tele-practice (i.e., online). One parent indicated that their child had difficulty focusing. This statement applied to the provision of speech and occupational therapy.   
- Some parents indicated that the provision of related services through tele-practice was challenging.   
  
Sub-question #2  
What is your experience with the provision of a one-to-one aide as a component of the IEP?  
Themes  
- The provision of a one-to-one aide at the high school level was challenging. The assignment of the one-to-one aide was not consistent.  
- The One-to-one aide supported online instruction.   
  
Question#2: How has your child’s school helped you to understand your child’s IEP?  
Themes  
- Draft IEP documents were provided prior to the meeting.  
- Some parents reported that no documents were shared prior to the meeting.  
- The Teacher reviewed and explained the IEP drafts prior to the meeting.  
- The transition requirement was not explained to the parents of a child at the high school level.   
- The parent was provided the opportunity to ask questions and provide input.  
  
Question #3: How has your child’s school helped you to help your child by providing training and information?  
Themes  
- No school-based training or any other training was provided during SY2020-2021.  
- Training was provided by the SPED department (referring to the Division of Special Education).  
- Information was obtained from Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
- Some parents indicated they did not always receive the information disseminated, such as the flyer for the input session.   
- Schools provided parents with information through the use of Class Dojo, which is a communication platform.  
- Some parents indicated that training in the IEP was included for entire IEP team. This training was to include the parents.   
  
Question #4: How has your child’s school communicated with you in order for you to help your child improve in school?  
 All the parents indicated there was at least one form of communication between the school and the home. The methods of communication shared by the parents include the following:   
- Sent an email or called me.   
- Email or through WhatsApp  
- The School Team asked parents how they would like to communicate – WhatsApp chat group, phone call, or email  
- Email or phone  
- Communicated with me in the car line  
- Automated phone system used by GDOE; parent likes it when she is informed when her daughter was late for classes  
- Announcements  
- Messages   
  
Question #5: How has your child’s school helped you to understand your parent rights?  
Themes  
- Parents are provided a copy of the procedural safeguards.  
- Division and parent groups have provided training, but no training was provided by the school.  
- No training was provided from the department to understand parent rights.  
- Rights were not explained. Parent was informed to call a number or another organization to receive an explanation of the rights.  
  
Question #6: What was your experience when your child was initially evaluated or reevaluated to determine the initial or continued need for special education and related services?  
None of the parents had children who were initially evaluated during the reporting period. The responses are as follows:  
- Don’t recall!  
- One missed a reevaluation  
- I believe my child is up for a re-evaluation.  
  
Question #7: What has been your experience with your child’s education since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic?  
Themes  
- One parent commented that it was "a big challenge."  
- Students had difficulty focusing online.  
- It was difficult transitioning from online to in-person instruction.   
  
Summary   
The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in a low participation rate in both the virtual focus group session as well as the in-person session. The limited communication options with parents to inform them about the focus group sessions may have resulted in the low participation.  
  
The responses of the parents are limited due to the low numbers. However, there were several areas of strengths and areas for growth:  
  
Strengths  
- Schools used various modes to communicate with parents.   
- Procedural Safeguards are provided to every parent.  
- There is an increase in the provision of IEP drafts and communication prior to the meeting.   
  
Areas for Growth   
- All the parents stated that they would benefit from school-based training.  
- The parent rights must be explained by a qualified professional.   
- With the use of blended learning (online and in-person learning), schools must provide students the opportunity to participate in a learning mode that will ensure they receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE).   
- Revisit the use of tele-practice as a method of providing related services. Some students do not benefit from this type of practice.   
- As appropriate for meeting the FAPE for a child, parent training should be included in the IEP.  
  
Recommendations  
1. Determine the most effective way to disseminate information to parents to ensure they receive the information.   
  
2. Ensure that parents are informed of their parent rights and that they understand their rights.  
  
3. Review the list of items under Areas for Growth above.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8 - OSEP Response

Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.   
  
Guam did not provide any data for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the Guam met its target.  
  
Guam provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps Guam has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 8 - Required Actions

Guam did not provide data for FFY 2020. Guam must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Guam must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions Guam is taking to address this issue. Guam must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.   
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Guam must report the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

Per OSEP instructions, Indicator 9 is not applicable to Guam.

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below**

Per OSEP instructions, Indicator 10 is not applicable to Guam.

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**Measurement**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 44.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.68% | 93.49% | 93.42% | 96.58% | 84.98% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 211 | 164 | 84.98% | 100% | 77.73% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage**

Guam Part B personnel conducted drill down exercises to determine the reasons for the slippage with Indicator 11 performance. The reasons for the slippage are attributed to the following:  
  
(1) A majority of the delays in evaluations stemmed from the following referral areas: psycho-educational evaluations, OT, Speech, Autism and Emotional Disabilities. There is a shortage of qualified personnel within the Division to conduct the assessments in these areas. Steps are being initiated to offer part-time pay for individuals who are willing to take on more referrals so that evaluations could be conducted timely.  
  
(2) To address Occupational Therapy assessments: There were licensing issues for the Occupational Therapists hired by GDOE's contracted vendor. The vendor faced challenges in receiving their OT licenses in order to practice on Guam. The Guam Board of Allied Health Examiners, which is an office within the Department of Public Health and Social Services was not as responsive to GDOE's contracted vendor. As of January 2022, however, all GDOE schools now have an assigned Occupational Therapist to conduct evaluations and provide occupational therapy to students with disabilities needing OT services per their IEPs; and  
  
(3) To address other referral areas impacted by COVID-19: During SY2020-2021, GDOE operated with three modes of learning which included hard-copy curriculum, online learning, and in-person or face-to-face (FTF) instruction. From August 2020 through December 2020, hard copy packet and online learning were the only modes of learning offered. It was not until January 2021 that in-person learning was offered on an A/B Cohort schedule. For those students who received FTF instruction, students attended classes 1x or 2x per week based on their A/B Cohort Schedule. Evaluators found it challenging to schedule in-person assessments because of social distancing and maximum space requirements at the school sites. Additionally, most parents wanted their children tested in-person instead of online, even though online assessments were offered. It should also be noted that the Division psycho-educational evaluators received their training and licenses on Q-Global in October 2020 which delayed the online assessments for a few months. Moreover, students who were scheduled for assessments on their designated cohort day were absent from school which further delayed the completion of their assessments. Added to this, Social Workers from the Division were deployed to assist with the efforts of the Department of Public Health and Social Services (DPHSS) in providing services to those in quarantine due to COVID-19. This action affected the number of Social Workers left to conduct assessments for students referred for emotional disabilities.   
  
To address the impact of COVID-19, GDOE has opened its doors to 5 days a week of instruction, both in-person and online beginning November 29, 2021. The psycho-educational evaluators now have their Q-Global licenses so that online assessments could be conducted; personnel who are assigned to conduct Autism evaluations have been trained to conduct online assessments using the Brief Observation of the Symptoms of Autism (BOSA); and two Social Workers have returned from their duties at the the DPHSS.  
  
Moving forward, to mitigate and keep track of the completion of evaluations to meet the 60-Day Timeline, an individual has been designated as the "Indicator 11 Monitor" within the Division of Special Education. This individual will be tracking the completion of evaluations on a weekly basis, in addition to the weekly reports generated by the Division's Data Office. Additionally, training will be conducted with case managers to ensure the appropriateness of the referrals submitted for initial assessments.

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

47

**Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.**

For the reporting period 7/1/2020 to 6/30/2021 there were a total of 211 children for whom parental consents to evaluate were received during this reporting period. Of the 211 parental consents received, 164 were evaluated within the 60-Day time-line. There are 47 children to report in the “Account For” category described below:   
  
- 14 children were evaluated 1-30 Days after the 60-Day Timeline. These delays were noted as Program Delays.  
- 21 children were evaluated 31-60 Days after the 60-Day Timeline. These delays were noted as Program Delays.  
- 12 children were evaluated 61+ Days after the 60-Day Timeline. These delays were noted as Program Delays.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The procedure that describes the identification, evaluation, and eligibility process are outlined in the Handbook for the Delivery of Special Education Services. These procedures guide the IEP Coordinators (IEPCs) and Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are responsible for obtaining the necessary documents and initiating the referral process. Guam DOE follows the IDEA 2004 regulation for the 60-Day Timeline requirement. Guam has determined that the definition of "receipt of parental consent" is the date when the IEPC or CRT receives the signed parent consent form; this "receipt of parental consent" is what initiates the 60-Day Timeline.  
  
The signed parental consent, a referral form, and all other documents supporting the need for an evaluation(s) are submitted to the Special Education Data Office where data is entered into the database. The Data Office disseminates the referral, which is inclusive of the parental consent to the support staff and evaluators of the areas specified on the referral. Guam defines "evaluation completed" as all assessments completed and documented through written reports. Upon completion of the evaluation(s), an eligibility meeting is held.  
  
Standard Operating Procedures were also developed to ensure the completion of the evaluation within the 60-Day Timeline. Upon data entry, a report is generated by the Data Office that includes the following information: Student Name and Unique Identifier Number, school, grade, referral or evaluation area(s), permission received date, the 60-Day Timeline date, assessment completion date, and eligibility determination, to include eligibility determination date. The report is issued to the Program Coordinators for their review at the beginning of every week. Each Program Coordinator tracks the completion of the evaluations in their designated Units. This weekly monitoring process ensures that all Units are kept abreast of any referrals that may have been missed or not submitted to the respective evaluator in a timely manner.  
  
If a student is not evaluated within a 60-Day allotted time frame, the referral is placed on a "Priority Status" and is aggressively monitored until the assessment has been completed. Reasons for delay of the evaluation are documented by the assigned evaluator on the Reasons for Delay Form and submitted to the Data Office for documentation purposes. The weekly report generated by the SPED Data Office is used in conjunction with the monthly Indicator 11: 60-Day Timeline Report to assist with the verification and validation of data that is submitted and entered into the database.  
  
The Division is reinstating the use of an "Indicator 11 Monitor" whereby one designated person is tasked to aggressively monitor the completion of initial referrals. The use of this designated individual is an additional strategy the Division is employing to increase compliance with Indicator 11 requirements.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

As an update to the 25 individual students who did not meet the 60-Day Timeline during the FFY 2019 reporting period, the following is reported.   
- 2 students had all their evaluations completed 1-30 days after the 60-Day Timeline; and  
- 23 students had all their evaluations completed 60+ days after the 60-Day Timeline.  
  
Eligibility meetings for these children have been conducted and all students are receiving special education and related services. This information was confirmed through a report that was generated by the Division's Data Office as of January 19, 2022.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 |  |  | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2013 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2013**

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019:  
  
In FFY 2019, Indicator 11 performance was 84.98% (283/333) compliance with the 60-day initial evaluation timeline. As described in the FFY 2019 APR, by the end of the reporting year, there were 25 initial evaluations that were completed over the 60-day timeline and 25 initial evaluations pending completion due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. In the FFY 2020 APR Indicator 11 Indicator Data section, Guam reported that all 25 pending evaluations from FFY 2019 were completed over timeline within the FFY 2020 reporting period. These individual noncompliance were part of the subsequent data for the findings of noncompliance issued to the Division of Special Education in FFY 2013. Therefore, a written notice of noncompliance findings was not issued for the FFY 2019 Indicator 11 noncompliance data.  
  
FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected:  
  
The three FFY 2013 findings of noncompliance transferred from the school to the Division of Special Education remained in FFY 2020 for not being able to demonstrate correct implementation of the 60-day timeline requirement for subsequent data.   
  
On November 15, 2021, GDOE’s Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) reported that the three findings of noncompliance transferred from the school to the Division of Special Education remained “not yet verified as corrected” because the Division was unable to demonstrate correct implementation of the Child Find compliance requirements for initial evaluations.   
  
The CMO described that subsequent data for initial evaluations in the FFY 2020 reporting period through November 3, 2021 continued to report noncompliance with the initial evaluation timeline requirement.   
  
Actions Taken to Address Noncompliance:  
  
As reported in the FFY 2020 APR Indicator 11 Data section, Guam Part B described the issues in meeting the 60-day timeline initial evaluation requirements and actions taken to address the noncompliance. These include:  
  
(1) A majority of the delays in evaluations stemmed from the following referral areas: psycho-educational evaluations, OT, Speech, Autism and Emotional Disabilities. There is a shortage of qualified personnel within the Division to conduct the assessments in these areas. Steps are being initiated to offer part-time pay for individuals who are willing to take on more referrals so that evaluations could be conducted timely.   
  
(2) To address Occupational Therapy assessments: There were licensing issues for the Occupational Therapists hired by GDOE's contracted vendor. The vendor faced challenges in receiving their OT licenses in order to practice on Guam. The Guam Board of Allied Health Examiners, which is an office within the Department of Public Health and Social Services was not as responsive to GDOE's contracted vendor. As of January 2022, however, all GDOE schools now have an assigned Occupational Therapist to conduct evaluations and provide occupational therapy to students with disabilities needing OT services per their IEPs; and   
  
(3) To address other referral areas impacted by COVID-19: During SY2020-2021, GDOE operated with three modes of learning which included hard-copy curriculum, online learning, and in-person or face-to-face (FTF) instruction. From August 2020 through December 2020, hard copy packet and online learning were the only modes of learning offered. It was not until January 2021 that in-person learning was offered on an A/B Cohort schedule. For those students who received FTF instruction, students attended classes 1x-2x per week based on their A/B Cohort Schedule. Evaluators found it challenging to schedule in-person assessments because of social distancing and maximum space requirements at the school sites. Additionally, most parents wanted their children tested in-person instead of online, even though online assessments were offered. It should also be noted that the Division psycho-educational evaluators received their training and licenses on Q-Global in October 2020 which delayed the online assessments for a few months. Moreover, students who were scheduled for assessments on their designated cohort day were absent from school which further delayed the completion of their assessments. Added to this, Social Workers from the Division were deployed to assist with the efforts of the Department of Public Health and Social Services (DPHSS) in providing services to those in quarantine due to COVID-19. This action affected the number of Social Workers left to conduct assessments for students referred for emotional disabilities.   
  
To address the impact of COVID-19, GDOE has opened its doors to 5 days a week of instruction, both in-person and online beginning November 29, 2021. The psycho-educational evaluators now have their Q-Global licenses so that online assessments could be conducted; personnel who are assigned to conduct Autism evaluations have been trained to conduct online assessments using the Brief Observation of the Symptoms of Autism (BOSA); and two Social Workers have returned from their duties at the the DPHSS.   
  
Moving forward, to mitigate and keep track of the completion of evaluations to meet the 60-Day Timeline, an individual has been designated as the "Indicator 11 Monitor” within the Division of Special Education. This individual will be tracking the completion of evaluations on a weekly basis, in addition to the weekly reports generated by the Division's Data Office. Additionally, training will be conducted with case managers to ensure the appropriateness of the referrals submitted for initial assessments.

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 were corrected.   
  
When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019, and remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013, Guam: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within Guam's jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

In FFY 2019, Indicator 11 performance was 84.98% (283/333) compliance with the 60-day initial evaluation timeline. As described in the FFY 2019 APR, by the end of the reporting year, there were 25 initial evaluations that were completed over the 60-day timeline and 25 initial evaluations pending completion due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. In the FFY 2020 APR Indicator 11 Indicator Data section, Guam reported that all 25 pending evaluations from FFY 2019 were completed over timeline within the FFY 2020 reporting period. These individual noncompliance were part of the subsequent data for the findings of noncompliance issued to the Division of Special Education in FFY 2013. Therefore, a written notice of noncompliance findings was not issued for the FFY 2019 Indicator 11 noncompliance data.  
  
FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected:  
  
The three FFY 2013 findings of noncompliance transferred from the school to the Division of Special Education remained in FFY 2020 for not being able to demonstrate correct implementation of the 60-day timeline requirement for subsequent data.   
  
On November 15, 2021, GDOE’s Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) reported that the three findings of noncompliance transferred from the school to the Division of Special Education remained “not yet verified as corrected” because the Division was unable to demonstrate correct implementation of the Child Find compliance requirements for initial evaluations.   
  
The CMO described that subsequent data for initial evaluations in the FFY 2020 reporting period through November 3, 2021 continued to report noncompliance with the initial evaluation timeline requirement.   
  
Actions Taken to Address Noncompliance:  
  
As reported in the FFY 2020 APR Indicator 11 Data section, Guam Part B described the issues in meeting the 60-day timeline initial evaluation requirements and actions taken to address the noncompliance.

## 11 - OSEP Response

Guam provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps Guam has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 11 - Required Actions

Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining three findings identified in FFY 2019 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that it: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.   
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 90.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 53 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 15 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 32 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 6 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 0 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 32 | 32 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**

0

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Guam Part B receives an LEA Notification which initiates a referral from Part C to Part B for children who may be in need of continued services from Part B. This LEA Notification is submitted to Part B as early as 9 months before the child's 3rd birthday, and no later than 33 months of age. After participating in the child's Transition Conference, which is facilitated by Part C personnel, the Preschool IEP Coordinator (IEPC) is responsible for submitting the referral with the consent from the parent for an evaluation, and also monitoring the time frame for completing the evaluations within 60 days from parent consent to determining eligibility and developing and implementing an IEP by the child's 3rd birthday. The IEPC also meets monthly with the Part B Program Coordinator for the Birth through 5 Program to review each pending referral.  
  
Additionally, Guam Part C provides a monthly report on all LEA Notifications sent to Part B. The Part B data system keeps track of all the LEA Notifications submitted and provides the Birth through 5 Program Coordinator a monthly report that includes a calculated percentage using OSEP's measurement for Indicator 12, of those children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact:  
Over the years, Guam Part B has been able to demonstrate 100% compliance with Indicator 12 requirements. It should be noted however that in FFY 2020, there were six (6) children whose parents refused consent which caused delays in evaluation or initial services. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on families and our community could have contributed to the parent refusals.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 99.84% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 91.32% | 90.77% | 85.21% | 97.32% | 83.40% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 462 | 507 | 83.40% | 100% | 91.12% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

To calculate Indicator 13 performance, Guam Part B uses data from the special education data system for the entire reporting period. The Division of Special Education Data Office inputs the student IEP data into the special education data system based on the submitted data sheets and IEP documents from the schools. The data sheets includes verification that the IEP meets the secondary transition requirements for youth with disabilities aged 16 and older. As IEP meetings are held during the school year, the data sheets and IEPs are submitted to the Division Data Office for input into the special education data system. The special education data system is updated with each students' current information and status. At the end of the reporting period, Guam Part B verifies current Indicator 13 data for those youth with IEPs for the entire reporting period.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Targeted technical assistance is on-going and will be more intensive to assist the schools with meeting this compliance indicator through the following activities:  
  
- Division of Special Education Transition Services Unit will continue to provide technical assistance to school personnel by having Division Transition Technical Assistants assigned to specific school sites;  
  
- At the beginning of the school year, the Division of Special Education provided school personnel (Consulting Resource Teacher or Transition Teacher and School Administrators) with a school report and an IEP/Reevaluation Calendar with guidance on scheduling IEPs and Re-Evaluations. School reports are also provided monthly, thereafter; and  
  
- Monthly Indicator 13 reports are generated and provided to each school administrator, Consulting Resource Teacher and Transition Teacher.  
  
It must be noted that the Division also works closely with the Compliance Monitoring Office after a random review of student folders is conducted. Based on that review, a more comprehensive and targeted technical assistance is given to each high school team, inclusive of Division personnel from the Secondary Transition Office. This training and targeted technical assistance will assist the schools with providing quality data (valid and reliable) for reporting purposes and with ensuring the implementation of the transition plans that are developed. This training is provided annually in September at the beginning of each school year to transition personnel in the Division and the schools. Targeted technical assistance is on-going and will be more intensive during SY2021-2022 to assist the schools with meeting this compliance indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 44 | 1 | 43 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

In March 2020 and June 2020, the GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) issued written notification of noncompliance findings to six high schools for not meeting the Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements. The total number of individual instances of noncompliance for the six high schools was 44. The remaining one high school was not issued a notice because the CMO was monitoring verified correction for the noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2018.  
  
The FFY 2019 APR Indicator 13 performance data of 83.40% (397/476) reported 79 noncompliance that included the 44 individual instances of noncompliance for the six high schools that were issued a written notice in March 2020 and June 2020 and 35 individual noncompliance that were subsequent data for verifying correction of noncompliance for all seven high schools, inclusive of the one high school with noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2018.   
  
In March 2021, the CMO issued a verified timely correction of noncompliance notice to one of the six high schools identified as having a total of one Indicator 13 secondary transition noncompliance in FFY 2019. The notice indicated that the one high school was able to meet the secondary transition compliance requirement, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, within the one year timeframe from March 2020. The CMO verified correction through a review of school data reports. The school data reports showed that the individual instance of noncompliance was corrected, and subsequent data (additional IEPs) met the Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements at 100% compliance. This one high school therefore demonstrated that they were correctly implementing Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements.  
  
In August 2021 and January 2022, the CMO issued verified subsequent correction of noncompliance notices to the remaining five high schools identified as having a total of 43 Indicator 13 secondary transition noncompliance in FFY 2019. The notices indicated that the five high schools were able to meet the secondary transition compliance requirement, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, beyond the one year timeframe from June 2020. The CMO verified correction through a review of school data reports. The school data reports showed that the individual instances of noncompliance were corrected, and subsequent data (additional IEPs) met Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements at 100% compliance. These five high schools therefore demonstrated that they were correctly implementing Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The CMO verifies that the individual instances of noncompliance were corrected through a review of school data reports generated by the Division of Special Education. The Division of Special Education receives the IEP documents from the schools and inputs the required data elements into the Special Education database. The CMO requests for the school data reports based on the timeframe established in the written notification of noncompliance findings.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2018 | 27 |  | 27 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

In FFY 2018, the GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) issued a written notification of noncompliance findings to one high school for not meeting Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements. A total of 27 individual instances of noncompliance was identified in the written notification of noncompliance issued to the one high school.   
  
The FFY 2018 APR Indicator 13 performance data of 97.32% (545/560) included the individual instances of noncompliance identified for the one high school, as well as subsequent data for verified correction of noncompliance. In addition, the FFY 2019 APR Indicator 13 performance data of 83.40% (397/476) included subsequent data for review for verifying correction of noncompliance.   
  
In December 2021, the CMO verified correction of noncompliance through a review of the school data report. The December 2021 verification memorandum indicated that the high school did not meet the verified correction of the noncompliance requirement based on the subsequent data reviewed not meeting 100% compliance.   
  
It should be noted that in the June 2020 “failure to correct” memorandum, the CMO acknowledged the correction of the 27 individual instances of noncompliance, which were the findings of noncompliance issued to the high school in FFY 2018. The CMO verified that the 27 individual instances were corrected through a review of the school data report. The “failure to correct” was explained to be related to the review of subsequent data, additional IEPs.  
  
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected:  
  
In the December 2021 “failure to correct” memorandum, the CMO required the high school to specifically correct the subsequent data or pending IEPs listed in the report. In addition, the CMO indicated that a follow-up verification of subsequent correction would be scheduled in February 2022.

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining 27 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected.   
  
When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019, and remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018, Guam: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within Guam's jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

Guam provided the required response for the Indicator 13 Prior FFY Required Actions in the Indicator Data section. Guam reported that the FFY 2019 findings of noncompliance were verified timely or subsequently corrected. The FFY 2018 findings of noncompliance for the one high school however continues to be not verified as corrected.

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining 43 findings identified in FFY 2019 and 27 findings identified in FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that it: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 18.00% | 19.00% | 20.00% | 21.00% | 21.00% |
| A | 11.00% | Data | 16.30% | 4.60% | 23.19% | 16.67% | 14.77% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 61.00% | 62.00% | 63.00% | 64.00% | 64.00% |
| B | 51.00% | Data | 61.96% | 49.43% | 66.67% | 62.75% | 64.77% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 68.00% | 69.00% | 70.00% | 71.00% | 71.00% |
| C | 60.00% | Data | 69.57% | 55.17% | 68.12% | 72.55% | 65.91% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 10.53% | 11.00% | 11.50% | 12.00% | 12.50% | 13.00% |
| Target B >= | 52.63% | 54.00% | 55.00% | 56.00% | 57.00% | 58.00% |
| Target C >= | 53.95% | 55.00% | 56.00% | 58.00% | 60.00% | 62.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information from stakeholder sessions:  
  
During the smaller focus group sessions, stakeholders which included Division personnel, case managers, and school administrators reviewed the survey results for Indicator 14. The group noted that the response rate was higher than the previous FFY 2019 reporting year. They also reviewed data from previous reporting years to see the growth and changes from year to year. Discussions were also held to determine how best to get updated demographic data from its student population prior to them exiting from high school in order to increase representativeness.  
  
At the large stakeholder sessions, parent participants indicated that there are some students who may not be ready to do anything after one year of graduating from high school. Parents noted that COVID-19 played a big role in what was available for our youth with IEPs who graduated. The job market and opportunities to go out and apply for jobs was very slim given the social distancing and masking requirements imposed on the entire island.  
  
In the end, Guam Part B, together with its stakeholders determined that they would start with the end in mind as the final target for FFY 2025 and then work backwards to FFY 2020. It was through this method that the targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 were established for Indicator 14.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 110 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 76 |
| Response Rate | 69.09% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 8 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 32 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 1 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 8 | 76 | 14.77% | 10.53% | 10.53% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 40 | 76 | 64.77% | 52.63% | 52.63% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 41 | 76 | 65.91% | 53.95% | 53.95% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate | 55.34% | 69.09% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

Guam Part B's response rate for Indicator 14 for FFY 2020 is 69.09%. This means that of the 110 students who left school last year, post school outcome information was not available for 30.91% (n=34) of the Leavers who exited the Guam Department of Education. This FFY 2020 response rate is an increase from last year's response rate of 55.35% (88/155) for Indicator 14.  
  
Initially, surveys were sent out through the mail using the home addresses on file. Personnel from the Division of Special Education's Transition Office found it quite challenging as many of the surveys mailed out came back with a "Return to Sender" message. Other attempts to contact the Leavers included contacting them through phone or through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram. Many of the phone numbers on record were either disconnected or no longer in use; and although contacts were made with some Leavers via social media, the Leavers did not respond to requests made for them to contact Division personnel.  
  
Guam Part B will continue its efforts to increase the response rate for Indicator 14. Additional steps to increase the response rate will include follow-up activities with the Leavers and/or their families to ensure that the respondents are representative of Guam's population:  
  
- Before leaving or graduating from school, the demographics are updated.  
- Demographics are updated periodically within the year before leaving high school.  
- Continue alternative social media methods, such as FaceBook and InstaGram.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Guam Part B used the NTACT Response Calculator to calculate representativeness of the respondent group of the characteristics of: (a) disability type; (b) ethnicity; (c) gender; and (d) exit status (e.g., dropout) to determine whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to or different from the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2019-2020. According to the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of plus/minus 3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness. In the Response Calculator, the color red is used to indicate a difference exceeding a plus/minus 3% interval.  
  
For FFY 2020, Guam reported that the data collected from its respondents was not representative of the 2019-2020 leaver population. This was based on the data reported in the NTACT Response Calculator; specifically, the respondents were under-represented in the emotional disability, intellectual disability, and all other disability categories. There was over-representation in the specific learning disability, female and minority categories for this reporting year.  
  
The steps taken to reduce any identified bias and to promote responses from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the same time they left school continue to be through the updates of demographics before students leave high school and through the use of social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Guam Part B used the NTACT Response Calculator to calculate representativeness of the respondent group of the characteristics of: (a) disability type; (b) ethnicity; (c) gender; and (d) exit status (e.g., dropout) to determine whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to or different from the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2019-2020. According to the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of plus/minus 3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness. In the Response Calculator, the color red is used to indicate a difference exceeding a plus/minus 3% interval.  
  
For FFY 2020, Guam reported that the data collected from its respondents was not representative of the 2019-2020 leaver population. This was based on the data reported in the NTACT Response Calculator; specifically, the respondents were under-represented in the emotional disability, intellectual disability, and and all other disability categories and over-represented in the specific learning disability, female and minority categories for this reporting year.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

Strategies and Improvement Activities:  
  
Guam Part B's response rate for Indicator 14 for FFY 2020 is 69.09%. This means that of the 110 students who left school last year, post school outcome information was not available for 30.91% (n=34) of the Leavers who exited the Guam Department of Education. This FFY 2020 response rate is an increase from last year's response rate of 55.35% (88/155) for Indicator 14.  
  
Initially, surveys were sent out through the mail using the home addresses on file. Personnel from the Division of Special Education's Transition Office found it quite challenging as many of the surveys mailed out came back with a "Return to Sender" message. Other attempts to contact the Leavers included contacting them through phone or Facebook. Many of the phone numbers on record were either disconnected or no longer in use; and although contacts were made with some Leavers via social media, the Leavers did not respond to requests made for them to contact Division personnel.  
  
Guam Part B will continue its efforts to increase the response rate for Indicator 14, with particular attention to the Leavers that fall under the emotional disabilities, intellectual disabilities and all other disabilities categories. Additional steps to increase the response rate will include follow-up activities with the Leavers and/or their families to ensure that the respondents are representative of Guam's population:  
  
- Before leaving or graduating from school, the demographics are updated.  
- Demographics are updated periodically within the year of leaving high school.  
- Continue alternative social media methods, such as FaceBook and InstaGram.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

As reported above, Guam Part B utilized the NTACT Response Calculator to determine the representativeness of its respondents.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |
| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact:   
With many of the business closures, there were limited opportunities for employment for Leavers. Follow-up by teachers with the Leavers was also limited because of social distancing requirements. This also affected the ability of the Division of Special Education Transition Office personnel to conduct the post-school outcomes survey with the Leavers; and for the Leavers to seek employment opportunities.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, Guam must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions that Guam is taking to address this issue. Guam must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

In the Indicator 14 Data section, Guam reported its FFY 2020 analysis for determining representativeness using the NTACT PSO calculator and actions Guam is taking to address this issue.

## 14 - OSEP Response

Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Guam must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions Guam is taking to address this issue. Guam must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 3 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 1 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information from stakeholder sessions:  
  
Because Guam has not reached its threshold of 10 resolution sessions, baseline and targets were not discussed or established for Indicator 15. Stakeholders were informed that per OSEP instructions, States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than ten (10). Guam Part B, therefore, did not establish a baseline or determine targets for Indicator 15 for FFY 2020.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data | 100.00% | 85.71% | 100.00% | 50.00% | 87.50% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 3 | 87.50% |  | 33.33% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

Guam reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. Guam is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 0 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information from stakeholder sessions:  
  
Because Guam has not reached its threshold of 10 mediations, baseline and targets were not discussed or established for Indicator 16. Stakeholders were informed that per OSEP instructions, States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than ten (10). Guam Part B, therefore, did not established a baseline or determined targets for Indicator 16 for FFY 2020.  
  
Guam Part B has historically reported zero (0) mediations filed for Indicator 16.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  | 100.00% | 0.00% |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

Guam reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. Guam is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Measurement**

The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

**Baseline Data*:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

The Guam Department of Education (GDOE), a unitary educational system, facilitated the development of Guam’s FFY 2020 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 6, which reports on the progress of the implementation plan and outcomes developed as the vehicle for improvement in infrastructure development and implementation of evidence-based practices for meeting Guam’s SSIP State-Identified Measurable Results (SIMR). In Phase 1 of the SSIP submitted to OSEP on April 1, 2015, Guam identified the following as its SIMR:  
  
There will be an increased percent of students with disabilities in the 3rd grade that will be proficient in reading in the four participating schools as measured by the district-wide assessment.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

The link for the Part B SSIP current Theory of Action is as follows:  
https://www.gdoe.net/files/user/13/file/AppendixA\_GUAM%20PART%20B%20THEORY%20OF%20ACTION%20ILLUSTRATION.pdf

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or** **justification for the changes.**

The modifications to be implemented are focused on the scale-up process. The justification for scaling up is centered on fostering long-term sustainability of evidence-based practices across the system in order to build broader impact. GDOE will scale-up in two distinct ways: through widespread implementation of reading evidence-based practices with the addition of three more target schools for a total of seven SSIP schools; and through deep changes in classroom practices with the addition of math evidence-based content strategies. Moreover, the scale-up process will be in conjunction with GDOE’s State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) activities which establishes a professional development system centered on developing agency, choice, and engagement with stakeholders by utilizing the Leading by Convening framework. The SPDG is also focused on sustainability and the widespread implementation of evidence-based practices for reading. Therefore, the core tasks for the scale-up process will include:  
- developing and providing support for implementation;  
- ensuring implementation to fidelity at each school site; and  
- evaluating and improving the scale-up process.  
  
Using the steps from the Institute of Education Sciences Continuous Improvement in Education: A Toolkit for Schools and Districts (2020), the following activities will be conducted in the next fiscal year for the new SSIP schools to address the core tasks for scaling up:  
  
Overarching Activity: GDOE provides guidance and support to help SSIP schools develop a framework of supports based on needs and readiness.  
  
Sub-activities:  
  
Part 1: Planning a Continuous Improvement Effort  
1. Assess the school’s readiness to engage in a continuous improvement effort  
2. Determine the overall focus of the continuous improvement effort  
3. Recruit Improvement Team members  
4. Identify Improvement Team members' roles and responsibilities  
5. Plan the Improvement Team calendar  
  
Part 2: Improvement Team Meetings  
1. Introduction to continuous improvement  
2. Defining the problem and determining root causes using a fish diagram  
3. Establishing an aim and developing a driver diagram  
4. Preparing for PDSA Cycles  
  
Part 3: Professional Development  
1. Integrate implementation support practitioners (ISPs) to support new schools  
2. Provide professional development to teachers on the continuous improvement cycle  
3. Provide professional development to teachers on data-based decision making.  
  
Timelines  
Part 1: Planning a Continuous Improvement Effort: Spring 2022 to Summer 2022  
Part 2: Improvement Team Meetings: Fall 2022  
Part 3: Professional Development: Spring 2023  
  
Expected short-term outcome for activities:  
Administrators understand how to support implementation of evidence-based reading instruction.  
  
Overarching Activity: GDOE identifies evidence-based math interventions and provides professional development on math instruction.  
For the current four SSIP schools, they will be scaling-up by adding depth to their classroom practice by adding on the math content. Since the current SSIP schools have been engaged in the continuous improvement framework for the last six years and have completed a math “Taking Stock” and needs assessment, they will begin with understanding the content and pedagogy of teaching math. The scale-up to Math at the current SSIP schools will begin with grades K-3 and will involve training, follow-up activities, and observations to ensure implementation to fidelity. It will be an ongoing process of continually learning, applying, and adapting content.  
  
Timelines  
- Training on evidence-based math interventions: Spring 2022 to Spring 2023  
- Small-group follow-up sessions: Spring 2022 to Spring 2023  
- Classroom Observations: Fall 2022 to Spring 2023  
  
Expected short-term outcome for activities:  
Teachers are knowledgeable of evidence-based math instruction, interventions, and universal screening tools.

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.***

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| FFY 2014 | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade 3 IEP Students Scored Proficient in Target Schools** | **Grade 3 IEP Students in Target Schools with Valid Scores** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| \*[[105]](#footnote-106)1 | 4 |  | 0.00% | \*[[106]](#footnote-107)1 | N/A | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

The data source for the FFY 2020 data is the district-wide assessment results for the FFY 2020 (SY2020-2021) assessments which include the ACT Aspire and the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) based on Alternate Academic Achievement Standards (AA-AAAS) for students with significant cognitive disabilities, conducted in Spring 2020. The ACT Aspire is a vertically-scaled and benchmarked system of standards-based assessment that can be used to track progress toward the Common Core State Standards and the ACT College Readiness Standards. It is designed to measure students’ progress in English, reading, Math, science, and writing from grades 3 to 10 toward readiness for college and career, allowing for comparisons from one grade-level to another and one cohort to another (Guam Annual State of Public Education Report, 2019). The MSAA are assessments in English Language Arts (ELA) and math and is designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3-8 and grade 11. The MSAA covers grade-level content standards at a simplified level, and it includes many built-in supports, modified materials, and accommodations.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, GDOE began SY2020-2021 implementing two modes of learning: online instruction and hard-copy learning packets. In January 2021, the district shifted to three modes of learning: online instruction, hard-copy learning packets, and in-person instruction once a week. Families who opted for in-person instruction were grouped into two cohorts. One group attended school on Wednesdays and the other group attended school on Thursdays. In the Spring of 2021, only students receiving in-person instruction participated in the district-wide assessments. Students receiving online instruction or learning packets did not participate in the district-wide assessments. For the ACT Aspire, the student’s raw score is transmuted into a three-digit scale score that provides a common language for discussing student achievement over time. Scaled scores that are above, at-grade level, below, or significantly below the ACT readiness benchmark are respectively categorized as “Exceeding” (Level 4) , “Ready” (Level 3), “Close” (Level 2), and “In Need of Support” (Level 1). In relation to the SIMR, Students placed in Levels 3 and 4 are considered “Proficient”.  
  
Although the MSAA is an online assessment tool, there is no mechanism for the students with disabilities to take this assessment remotely. The students who participated in this assessment were the students who received in-person instruction. The students need to be physically in school and then they are assessed by their teachers using the online tool. Depending on the response modes used by the student (i.e., the student uses eye-gaze or uses gestures or points to responses), the student’s response is entered into the MSAA system by the teacher; or the student enters the response to the questions independently. Students participating in the MSAA are scored on alternate achievement standards and given a scaled score and a corresponding performance level based on their responses. The performance levels are Level 4. Level 3, Level 2, and Level 1. Students who achieved a scaled score and a performance level of Level 3 or 4 meet expectations of proficiency and would be counted in the SIMR.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

Universal Screening Data  
Student Benchmark Data  
For Fall 2021, the aimswebPlus universal screener was administered to all Kindergarten through 3rd graders in the four SSIP target schools. The screening period was from October 11, 2021 – November 1, 2021.  
The following measures for the respective grade levels are:   
Grade & Measures  
Kindergarten - Initial Sounds (IS) and Letter Name Fluency (LNF)  
1st Grade - Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)  
2nd and 3rd Grade - Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) and Reading Comprehension   
   
The data for all students is provided and then disaggregated to reflect the participation and performance of students with an Individualized Education Program (IEP).   
   
Participation Rates   
The participation rate for all students is determined by dividing the number of students from the four target schools screened by the number of enrolled students in the same schools. The participation rate for students with an IEP is determined by dividing the total number of students with IEPs screened in the four target schools by the total number of students with an IEP from the same schools. The participation rate for all students in the SSIP schools is 97% (1016/1047); for students with IEPs, the participation rate is 72% (26/36).  
  
Performance Rates   
Kindergarten   
On the Initial Sounds (IS) measure, students performing at the average percentile (26th) or above is 43.4% (117/275). Students with IEPs who were at the average percentile or above is 14.3% (1/7). For IS, all students performing at benchmark, 35th percentile or above, is 30.6% (82/268). Students with IEPs performing at benchmark, 35th percentile or above, is 14.3% (1/7).  
  
On the Letter Naming Fluency (LNF) measure, students performing at the average percentile (26th) or above is 33.8% (93/275). Students with IEPs who were at the average percentile or above is 14.3% (1/7). For LNF, all students performing at benchmark, 35th percentile or above, is 32.8% (88/268). Students with IEPs performing at benchmark, 35th percentile or above, is 14.3% (1/7).  
  
1st grade  
On the ORF (ORF) measure, students performing at the average percentile (26th) or above is 21.8% (47/225). Students with IEPs who were at the average percentile or above is 0% (0/5). For ORF, all students performing at benchmark, 45th percentile or above, is 17.4% (38/219). Students with IEPs performing at benchmark, 45th percentile or above, is 0% (0/5).  
  
2nd and 3rd grade  
On the ORF measure, students performing at the average percentile (26th) or above is 39.4% (217/551). Students with IEPs who were at the average percentile or above is 0% (0/14). For ORF, all students performing at benchmark, 45th percentile or above, is 25% (131/528). Students with IEPs performing at benchmark, 45th percentile or above, is 0% (0/14).  
  
On the Reading Comprehension (RC) measure, students performing at the average percentile (26th) or above is 55.6% (302/543). Students with IEPs who were at the average percentile or above is 0% (0/14). For RC, all students performing at benchmark, 45th percentile or above, is 28% (149/526). Students with IEPs performing at benchmark, 45th percentile or above, is 0% (0/14).  
  
Summary  
For this reporting period, the gap between participation rates of all students and students with IEPs is 25%. This is contrary to historical data that has demonstrated that a majority of students, inclusive of those with IEPs, are screened. The gap is even greater in the area of performance with students with IEPs performing significantly behind their peers. Moving forward, recovering from the learning loss brought about by the pandemic will require intensive and deliberate intervention and support.  
  
IEP Data  
IEP File Folder Reviews  
Purpose  
Determine change in practices in writing present levels of academic achievement (PLAA) for reading statements as a result of coaching. The focus was limited to reading as this is the focus of the State-Initiated Measurable Results (SIMR).  
  
Methodology  
The Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) selected for review were based on IEPs in which the target schools’ special education and/or other school personnel received coaching during the reporting period (APR’21-DEC’21). The target schools that received coaching were based on the IEPs that were scheduled for an annual review meeting during this reporting period.   
  
Tool to Review the IEPs  
The tool selected for review was the IEP Checklist developed by a UOG CEDDERS consultant based on the required components and best practices for developing IEPs. Since the coaching sessions were limited to the development and update of the present levels of academic achievement specifically in reading, the Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP) was used for the review of the IEPs. The PLAAFP indicators are as follows:   
   
1. Academic achievement and functional performance are current (~within the last 30 days). If data is not current, STOP HERE.  
2. PLAAFP statements include both academic achievement and functional performance statements with the use of reliable and valid assessment tools and/or practices.  
3. PLAAFP statements are measurable and observable based on valid and reliable data. (Can you see it? Can you count it?)  
4. PLAAFP statements pass the Stranger’s Test (e.g., does not include the use of acronyms without a legend; is understood by any individual; does not require clarifying questions.  
5. PLAAFP includes statements of how the disability affects the child’s involvement and progress in the general curriculum.  
  
Reviewers  
There were a total of seven (7) reviewers from various disciplines. The reviewers included individuals with a background in either general education, special education, or both.   
  
Strategy for Reviewing  
Each of the seven reviewers conducted their review independently. The reviewing involved rating the IEP on the five indicators listed above with either a “1”, a “0”, or “UND (Undetermined). A rating of a “1” meant the indicator was present, a “0” indicated the IEP lacked the indicator, and a rating of “UND” meant it could not be determined. Each IEP review that resulted in a “0” for the first indicator resulted in a termination of the review for Items #2 to #5. After the completion of the independent review, the seven reviewers met virtually to reach consensus on whether each IEP met each of the indicators for the present levels in reading. The IEPs with a rating of “1” on four of the five indicators met the criteria for the IEP component.   
  
Results  
1. 64% (7/11) of IEPs reviewed met Indicator #1 related to the inclusion of current data. The review of the remaining four of the IEPs were not conducted because it did not meet the standard set for Indicator #1.  
2. 100% (7/7) of IEPs met the requirement for Indicator #2.  
3. 86% (6/7) of IEPs reviewed included statements that were measurable and observable (Indicator #3).  
4. None of the IEPs passed the Stranger’s Test.  
5. 57% (4/7) of the IEPs met the criteria for Indicator #5.  
6. 57% (4/7) of the IEPs met the criteria for at least four of the five indicators.  
   
Summary  
Data indicates an improvement in the development of the PLAAFP as a result of coaching. Last reporting period, only 27% (3/11) of the IEPs met the criteria for at least 4 out of the 5 indicators in comparison to 57% (4/7) of the IEPs reviewed for this reporting period, an increase of 30%. Moving forward, on-going, job-embedded professional learning activities and coaching to school personnel that extends beyond the PLAAFP will continue. The activities will be spaced-out, and participants will be provided the opportunity to reflect on their practices and provide feedback.  
   
SDI Classroom Observations  
See data and description under prompt: “Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity…”

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State’s ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

In January 2021, in-person instruction resumed but students receiving in-person instruction received only one day of in-person instruction a week. Students not receiving in-person instruction received instruction either online or through hard-copy learning packets. The ACT Aspire and MSAA summative assessments were conducted in the Spring of 2021. However, only students receiving in-person instruction participated in the district’s summative assessments. As a consequence, data completeness was significantly impacted due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In SY 2018-2019, pre-pandemic participation rates for all 3rd grade students was 96% (2102/2189). For 3rd grade students with IEPs, the participation rate for the same school year was 100% (80/80) (GDOE ASPER, 2019). For this reporting period, the participation rate for all 3rd grade students was 42% (880/2110). For 3rd grade students with IEPs, the participation rate was 43% (30/69) (GDOE ASPER, 2021). For the four SSIP target schools, the participation rate for students with IEPs mirrored that of the district at 44% (4/9) with the participation rate for general education students in the target schools higher than that of the district at 79% (165/210). As demonstrated, there was a significant impact on participation rates as compared to pre-pandemic participation data. Therefore, data completeness was severely limited.

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

https://www.gdoe.net/files/user/13/file/AppendixE\_%20Guam%20DOE%20General%20Evaluation%20Plan-Year4.pdf

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

GDOE’s SSIP is structured to address “what is required” of the system at the district and school levels that impact reading achievement. Starting with the end in mind, the critical work must be to improve reading instruction in the classroom. The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) Framework using the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) improvement cycle has been implemented at the classroom level to understand the dynamics of teaching and learning for improvement. Considered the “transformation zone”, the four participating SSIP elementary schools, in partnership with the Curriculum and Instructional Improvement Office and the Division of Special Education, represent a vertical slice of the system where the innovations are being implemented to determine effectiveness and implications for system-wide implementation.  
  
For this reporting period, the SSIP Action Plan provided the details for how support was provided to the four participating schools to improve infrastructure support at the district and school levels. Each of the objectives in the Action Plan was aligned with the Coherent Improvement Strategies (CIS) in the Theory of Action (TOA) and logic model.  
  
Each objective is supported by activities and evaluation methods to monitor and determine the progress of implementing the SSIP Action Plan. The SSIP implementation progress is reported by clusters of related objectives and infrastructure focus, referencing the related CIS. For each cluster, a description of outputs accomplished will be provided.  
  
CIS: #1 & #3: Continuum of Supports & Professional Development  
Objective 1: To increase the knowledge and skills of participating schools and district personnel in improvement science basics.  
Objective 4: To increase knowledge and skills in evidence-based instruction and intervention for reading in early grades.  
  
To meet Objectives 1 and 4, school professional development days and Professional Learning Community (PLC) time were used to give teachers and administrators from the participating schools the opportunity to meet outcomes and objectives from professional development activities. The following outcomes were targeted:  
- Increase knowledge and skills on data literacy for improving reading instruction.  
- Increase knowledge and skills on the use of data as part of the “Plan” step of the PDSA cycle.  
- Increase knowledge and skills on reading interventions as part of the “Do” step of the PDSA cycle.  
- Increase understanding of the “Study” and “Act” steps of the PDSA cycle.  
- Increase knowledge on evidence-based practices from the National Reading Panel on the five components of reading instruction; and  
- Increase skills in the application of evidence-based practices for reading instruction  
  
CIS #5: Using Data to Make Informed Decisions  
Objective 2: To increase the knowledge and skills in collecting and analyzing universal screening and progress monitoring data for reading.  
Objective 3: To increase the academic performance of students in participating schools in reading in the early grades.  
  
The outcomes to meet Objectives 2 and 3 mirror those under CIS#1 & CIS#3. However, as aforementioned, for this reporting period, data for aimswebPlus, the universal screener, was collected in Fall 2021. Fall 2021 data represents students receiving in-person instruction two to three times a week, as well as those receiving online instruction during SY2021-2022. Online students were scheduled by school personnel to participate in the assessment. Testing for online students took place at the school site during scheduled times during the school day.   
  
In addition, during Fall 2021, fidelity of implementation data for the universal screener was collected by school principals at the four SSIP schools to ensure that procedures and processes were consistent in all four schools and that reliable and valid data was being collected.  
  
Objective 3 included activities related to procuring and implementing technology for improving reading. Therefore, as GDOE shifted to online learning due the pandemic, the SSIP schools also pivoted to using online resources for reading. This included the use of the Raz-Plus online leveled readers for all students and Fast ForWord (FFW), a brain-based reading program for students with IEPs.  
  
CIS #2 & #4: Parents as Community Partners & TA Support, Coaching, Accountability  
Objective 5: To increase the Department’s coaching capacity in participating schools to improve reading achievement in the early grades.  
Objective 6: To increase the Department’s capacity in participating schools to improve reading achievement in the early grades.  
  
Objectives 5 and 6 prioritized building capacity of the support systems within GDOE. The discussion in this section is related to the support provided for improving reading instruction for all students, including students with disabilities, through the availability of instructional coaches, CRT-TAs, and school-level parent engagement activities.  
  
Instructional Coaches  
District-level instructional coaches (ICs) are assigned to each of the SSIP schools. GDOE ICs have an assignment ratio of one IC to two schools. Each SSIP school has an IC. The SSIP principals have identified and prioritized collaborative activities with the coaches in support of the SSIP priorities. ICs have attended many of the SSIP professional development sessions and have assisted in or facilitated professional development activities related to SSIP at the school-sites.  
  
Consulting Resource Teachers-Technical Assistance (CRT/TA)  
For this reporting period, the Division of Special Education assigned two CRT/TAs to the four SSIP schools. The CRT/TAs are responsible for supporting teachers and staff who work with students with disabilities to ensure reading skills for struggling students are addressed and targeted through the Individualized Education Program (IEP). This assignment provides consistency in support to the SSIP schools and augments the supports already being provided by the ICs. Moreover, the CRT/TAs support the schools in meeting compliance requirements as stipulated under IDEA in order to ensure successful student outcomes.  
  
School-level Family Engagement  
The SSIP schools have committed to continue with implementation of family engagement activities that include on-going communication with parents and incorporating the parents into their child’s learning process. Teachers are required to communicate with each parent at least once during the week. Additionally, the SSIP schools have all implemented a Raz-Plus home reading incentive program which encourages students to read at home and at school using the Raz-Plus online leveled reading program. For students without internet access, teachers are able to print the books for students. Student usage each month is monitored and students with the highest number of minutes spent reading using the program are recognized.  
  
In addition, SSIP schools have engaged parents through the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) platform which is led by parents. Due to COVID-19, PTO meetings have shifted to video conferencing platforms.   
  
Moreover, the GAPSD is considered Guam’s Part B “broad” stakeholder group of individuals who provide input, suggestions, and recommendations for improving special education and related services for children with disabilities on Guam. One of the SSIP Core Team members is also a GAPSD member who shares in the updates.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

CIS#1: Continuum of Supports  
Short-term Outcome Achieved: Administrators understand how to support implementation of evidence-based reading instruction.  
The short-term outcome for CIS#1 supports governance as it ensures that leadership at the school and local levels advocates for appropriate resources and effectively plans, communicates, and collaborates to drive ongoing system improvement. It is also related to data and accountability/monitoring and quality standards as administrators use data to inform decisions to determine the current status of the system and to support the implementation of quality programs.  
  
As evidenced through observations and document reviews, the SSIP school administrators have had a high degree of engagement in the implementation of evidence-based practices for reading at two levels: school and local. At the school-level, principals at the SSIP schools participated in grade-level Collaborative Learning Teams (CLTs) and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) on a weekly basis at their school sites. In these school-level sessions, the principals supported and guided teachers in the use of evidence-based practices for reading based on the data collected from the universal screener. Moreover, each principal has participated in classroom observations to gather fidelity data on the administration of the universal screener. At the local level, SSIP administrators have collaborated across their four schools in their implementation of evidence-based practices. Examples of cross-school collaboration include the following: participation in “Book Club” in which administrators engaged in leadership book studies to assist them in facilitating a focused and coherent curriculum for reading in their schools; sharing of best practices at their school sites; and facilitating an SSIP presentation to new potential SSIP scale-up schools. This strategy supports system change by ensuring that administrators are equipped with the knowledge and skills to guide teachers in the implementation of evidence-based practices and data-decision making to support the achievement of the SIMR.  
  
CIS#2: Parent & Community as Partners  
Short-term outcome Achieved: Parents are knowledgeable about strategies for supporting reading at home and in the community.  
The short-term outcome for CIS#2 is related to governance as the focus of CIS#2 is on building administrative structures that maximize family engagement and is aligned with the mission and vision of GDOE.  
  
Parent interviews and a review of the number and type of parent engagement strategies were conducted to gather information on how schools were helping parents to support their child in reading during the pandemic. The data from the parent interviews is discussed in subsequent sections. Other parent engagement strategies are also discussed under Section C. This strategy supports system change by recognizing that families are an important component to the achievement of the SIMR and for long-term sustainability especially with the continuation of remote learning for a portion of the student population. In addition, this strategy is aligned with the goals and activities of GDOE's SPDG which recognizes and values the involvement of families in building educational systems.   
  
CIS#3, CIS#4 & CIS#5: Professional Development; TA Support, Coaching, Accountability; and Using Data to Make Informed Decisions  
Short-term outcome Achieved: Teachers are knowledgeable about evidence-based reading instruction, interventions, and universal screening tools.  
  
The short-term outcome for CIS#3, #4, & #5 encompasses all areas of a systems framework. However, the areas most related to the short-term outcome are professional development/technical assistance, data, and quality standards. Key to building the capacity of teachers is using data to determine critical areas for professional development and to inform practices. The data drives the professional development activities which support the implementation of quality programs.   
  
The intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities include the number of school-level, job-embedded sessions that were conducted. The sessions conducted were focused on analyzing data for use in the Continuous Improvement Framework and to inform the use of evidence-based practices, specifically the explicit instruction model, to address core instruction as well as interventions for students struggling with reading. In addition, GDOE collaborated with the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) for the Pacific Convening on Interim Assessments. This partnership is critical since GDOE's interim assessment is also the universal screener for the SSIP. Furthermore, the SSIP schools are involved with GDOE's SPDG. The focus of the SPDG is on creating a more responsive and relevant professional development system that engages all stakeholders, including families. Key partners in GDOE's SPDG are the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), Autism Community Together (ACT), University of Guam School of Education, and Guam CEDDERS. Overall, these strategies support system change and are necessary for achievement towards the SIMR, sustainability, and scale-up because it is centered on developing the skill set of front-line implementers in the use of evidence-based practices.   
  
CIS #4: TA Support, Coaching, & Accountability  
Short-term outcome Achieved: Educators implement screening and interventions learned through PD and coaching with fidelity.  
The short-term outcome for CIS#4 is focused on the “action gap”, essentially “how” reading is taught and how screening is implemented. This short-term outcome is related to the areas of data, accountability, quality standards, and professional development. Data collected informs the system and drives professional development. The effectiveness of professional development is ascertained by how the interventions are being implemented in the classroom which is indicative of accountability and quality standards. This strategy supports system change and is necessary for achievement of the SIMR, sustainability and scale-up as it addresses how and to what degree evidence-based practices are implemented in the classroom.  
  
The intended outputs for this improvement strategy include the number of coaches providing technical assistance support to SSIP schools and the types of resources provided to sustain effective practices. In addition, observations on the fidelity of administration and implementation were also conducted to communicate the achievement of the improvement strategy.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Next Steps for CIS#1 & CIS#3: Continuum of Supports and Professional Development  
- Continued training and coaching on the delivery of explicit instruction for SDI and for core instruction;  
- Continued training on the 5 Components of Reading instruction;  
- Training on progress monitoring for Resource Room teachers; and  
- Continued coaching on the development of the IEP components.  
- Continued participation in GDOE's SPDG workgroups to assist in developing a more responsive and relevant professional development system that integrates both general education and special education themes.  
  
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:  
- Increased fidelity of implementation in the delivery of explicit instruction for SDI and core instruction;  
- Increased percentage of students at the SSIP schools on benchmark for reading;  
- Increased use of data-based decision making practices in the classroom; and  
- Increased alignment between the components of the IEP (PLAAFP, Annual Goals, and SDI).  
  
Next Steps for CIS#2: Parents as Community Partners   
- Continued parent training on how to use reading strategies at home;  
- Continued training on how to support learning at home using online resources; and  
- Continued training on the IEP process  
- Continued recruitment of families into GDOE's SPDG workgroups.  
  
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:  
- Increased knowledge in using reading strategies at home;  
- Increased usage of online reading resources; and  
- Increased number of students who enjoy reading and make the connection of reading at home to or with parents.  
  
Next Steps for CIS#4: TA Support, Coaching, and Accountability  
- Increased integration and collaboration of district coaches into SSIP activities;  
- Continued school-level coaching in the area of evidence-based practices and data literacy;   
- Use of teacher leaders as implementation support practitioners to assist in the scaling up to other schools; and  
- Continued use of resources and TA support from the national centers: NCSI, NCEO, NCII, NCIL, and NASDSE  
  
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:  
- Increased knowledge and skill of SSIP teachers in data literacy and evidence-based practices; and  
- Increased percentage of students at the SSIP schools on benchmark for reading.  
  
Next Steps for CIS#5: Using Data to Make Informed Decisions  
- Continued coaching and training on how to analyze and use data to inform the PDSA process; and  
- Training on progress monitoring for Resource Room teachers.  
  
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:  
- Increased knowledge and skills in data analysis for the universal screener;  
- Increased skills in making data informed decisions to drive PDSAs and lesson plans; and  
- Increased percentage of students at the SSIP schools on benchmark for reading.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

The evidence-based practices implemented during this reporting period include the following:  
- Universal screening   
- Continuous Improvement (Plan, Do, Study, Act)  
- Explicit Instruction  
- Five (5) Components of Reading Instruction  
- Coaching  
- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)  
- Family Engagement

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

Universal Screening   
Aligned with CIS #5  
Universal screening is a critical first step in identifying students who are at-risk for reading difficulties. Once identified, at-risk students can be provided with the appropriate scope of reading supports and interventions in addition to core instruction. Universal screening is essential in ensuring that reading problems are addressed timely before the achievement gap widens.  
  
Continuous Improvement (Plan, Do, Study, Act)  
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5  
Continuous improvement is centered on the premise that sustainable change is an ongoing process based on data collection, adaptation, and learning. Continuous improvement is focused on a specific problem and in testing practices and adapting them based on ongoing data collection. Three main questions guide the continuous improvement cycle (Shakman, K., Wogon,D., Rodriguez, S., Boyce, J., & Shaver, D., 2020):  
- What problem are we trying to solve?  
- What change might we introduce and why?  
- How will we know that a change is actually an improvement?  
  
Explicit Instruction  
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5  
Explicit instruction is a systematic, direct, purposeful way of teaching. Rosenshine (1987) defines explicit instruction as “a systematic method of teaching with emphasis on proceeding in small steps, checking for understanding, and achieving active and successful participation by all students”. The components of explicit instruction include having a clear objective, modeling, guided practice, independent practice, and supporting practices.   
  
Five (5) Components of Reading Instruction  
Aligned with CIS #1, 2, 3, 4, 5  
The Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read (April 2020) summarized research in the area of reading instruction. The National Reading Panel analysis was clear in its assertion that effective reading instruction must be systematic and explicit and must include the following components: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.  
  
Coaching  
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5  
Based on research by Joyce and Showers (2002), in order for the new skills learned in professional development to be transferred into the classroom, coaching is needed to help teachers successfully implement new knowledge and skills.  
  
Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)  
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5  
The PLC framework is centered on the tenets of continuous improvement. Three overarching principles undergird the PLC framework: ensure that students learn, a culture of collaboration, and a focus on results. In embracing the PLC framework, there is a shift from teaching to learning (Dufour, 2004). There are four focus questions that are threaded through a PLC meeting:  
- What do we want students to learn?  
- How do we know they’ve learned it?  
- What do we do if they haven’t learned it?  
- What do we do if they’ve learned it?  
  
Family Engagement  
Aligned with CIS # 2  
When student achievement and school improvement are seen as a shared partnership between the school and the home and when parents and school personnel see themselves as equal partners in the process, then family engagement will be bolstered. Research shows that when families create positive early literacy experiences for children in the home, then a pathway to become confident readers by 3rd grade will be set (Caspe and Lopez, 2017).

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

Universal Screening   
Aligned with CIS #5  
Activities and strategies that supported its use:  
- Training on administering the universal screener (aimswebPlus)  
- Training on data analysis using aimswebPlus reading data  
- Fidelity of administration observations were conducted to ensure that aimswebPlus was being administered with fidelity  
   
Impact on the SIMR:  
- At-risk students were identified in a timely manner (Change in program practice)  
- Data from the screener is used to drive class-wide and individual interventions (Change in teacher practices)  
   
Continuous Improvement (Plan, Do, Study, Act-PDSAs)  
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5  
Activities and strategies that supported its use:  
- Training on using data from aimswebPlus to develop a PDSA  
   
Impact on the SIMR:  
- Teachers and students use data to develop a goal and strategies to improve deficits in reading. (Change in teacher and student behavior)  
- Students take ownership of their data and their learning. (Change in student behavior)  
- Facilitates an on-going process of data collection, use of evidence-based practices, and adaptation based on data. (Change in teacher and program practices)  
- Provides the basis for the delivery of Core Instruction in addition to Intervention (Change in teacher and program practices)  
   
Explicit Instruction  
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5  
Activities and strategies that supported its use:  
- Overview session at the beginning of the year on how explicit instruction fits into the PDSA framework  
- Training for Resource Room Teachers (RRTs) in the use of explicit instruction in the delivery of the Direct Instruction (DI) Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Programs  
- Coaching for RRTs on the use of explicit instruction with the Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Programs  
   
Impact on the SIMR:  
- Increased proficiency in the delivery of the reading program. (Change in teacher practices)  
- Reading tasks are broken down into smaller steps to reduce the cognitive load for struggling readers. (Change in teacher practices)  
- Practice and corrective feedback are provided in a timely manner to increase the attainment and mastery of reading skills. (Change in teacher practices)  
  
Five (5) Components of Reading Instruction  
Aligned with CIS #1, 2, 3, 4, 5  
Activities and strategies that supported its use:  
- Training in the use of knowledge of the 5 Components of Reading instruction in the development of the PDSA  
- Training in using data from aimswebPlus to determine what area of reading instruction needs to be targeted in instruction and in the development of PDSAs.  
- Training of various evidence-based practices that fall under the 5 Components of Reading instruction (e.g. Elkonin boxes, repeated reading, word building, etc.)  
- Book study with administrators using the book Focus by Mike Schmoker which is centered on promoting literacy in schools by focusing on priorities.  
   
Impact on the SIMR:  
- Increased proficiency in the delivery of effective reading instruction. (Change in teacher practices)  
- Students are provided with reading instruction that is balanced and meets their needs. (Change in teacher practices)   
  
Coaching  
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5  
Activities and strategies that supported its use:  
- Leveraging of resources through the integration of CRT-TAs and instructional coaches to assist with coaching activities  
- Coaching of RRTs in the development of the PLAAFP  
- Coaching of RRTs in the delivery of Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading  
- Coaching of general education grade-level teachers in the delivery of reading instruction   
   
Impact on the SIMR:  
- Increased proficiency in the delivery of effective reading instruction. (Change in teacher practices)  
- The development of an effective PLAAFP statement drives the determination of the appropriate SDI to meet the unique needs of the student. (Change in teacher practices)  
   
Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)  
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5  
Activities and strategies that supported its use:  
- Session on the relationship between PLCs, PDSAs, and lesson plans  
- PLC sessions that focused on using the aimswebPlus data to inform practices and to develop PDSAs  
   
Impact on the SIMR:   
- Increased and deliberate focus on using data to drive instruction and interventions. (Change in teacher practices)  
- Increased and deliberate focus on identifying evidence-based strategies to address data (Change in teacher practices)  
  
Family Engagement  
Aligned with CIS # 2  
Activities and strategies that supported its use:  
- Monthly school newsletters that highlight priority standards and provide reading strategies and tips for families.  
- Weekly communication on child’s progress between teacher and families via phone, email, or notes  
- PTO meetings engaging parents in literacy activities  
- Home reading incentive program using the Raz-Plus online leveled reading books  
- Parent input sessions  
- Parent interviews to gather information on how schools have supported families in the reading achievement of their child  
- Participation in GDOE's SPDG which works with family groups to build a responsive and relevant professional development system  
   
Impact on the SIMR:   
- Increased knowledge of reading strategies for families. (Change in family practices)  
- Parents are accessing resources for supporting reading at home and in the community. (Change in family practices)  
- Students enjoy reading and make the connection of reading at home to or with parents. (Change in student behavior and outcomes)

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

Core Team Meeting Notes & Family Engagement Activities (CIS #1, 2)  
Core team meeting notes and the number and types of family engagement activities at each of the SSIP schools were used to determine the level of engagement of stakeholders.  
  
Universal Screener Fidelity Data (CIS #5)  
The practices associated with ORF and Early Literacy were observed during the Fall administration of the screener. This assessment was initiated in SY2019-2020 but not administered in SY2020-2021 due to COVID. The next administration occurred in the Fall 2021 during SY2021-2022. School principals used a standardized protocol and fidelity checklist in order to determine the level of fidelity in the administration of the aimswebPlus Early Literacy and Reading measures. For this reporting period, 40 teachers were observed administering ORF and 22 teachers were observed administering Early Literacy measures.  
  
Overall fidelity of implementation was examined as well as performance for each fidelity item. When analyzing the instructional and assessment practices in both the areas of Oral Reading Frequency (ORF) and Early Literacy, it was found that 69.30% of practices were implemented with fidelity. This is an increase from 2019-2020, in which baseline was established at 60.28%. Further examination provides evidence that ORF practices were implemented at a 63.78% fidelity level while Early Literacy practices were implemented at 74.81% fidelity rate, as observed in a sample of teachers across all four SSIP schools.   
  
PD/Training Feedback (CIS # 1, 3, 4, 5)  
The following indicates the percentage of satisfaction from participants with the professional development content provided:  
SSIP Overview: The Relationship Between PLCs, PDSAs, & Lesson Plans: 100% (89/89 )   
aimswebPlus Administration Training Sessions: 92% (11/12)   
NCEO Pacific Convening on Interim Assessments: 100% (36/36)  
Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading Training Series: 100% (2/2)   
M.U. Lujan Elementary–Analyzing aimswebPlus Data Session: 100% (4/4)   
M.U. Lujan Elementary Raz-Plus Online Leveled Reading Refresher: 100% (2/2)   
Price Elementary 1st Grade Phonemic Awareness Training Sessions (Part 1 and Part 2): 100% (4/4)   
  
Direct Instruction (DI) Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading Fidelity Data (CIS #1, 3, 4, 5)  
Observations were conducted with two resource room teachers at one SSIP school site and one resource room teacher at the other SSIP school site. Two of the four SSIP schools have no resource room teachers. All three observations showed that resource room teachers were using the DI reading programs (Reading Mastery I and Corrective Reading Decoding A) with their student in a 1:1 format.   
  
Based on these implementation areas: Organization, Procedure, and the Monitoring of Independent Work, data indicate the percentage of teachers observed conducting the task with fidelity:  
- Materials organized and ready: 100% (3/3)   
- Begins lesson promptly: 67% (2/3)   
- Students on task: 100% (3/3)   
- Follows steps and script in exercises: 67% (2/3)   
- Uses clear signals: 100% (3/3)   
- Students respond on signal in a conversational tone: 100% (3/3)   
- Allows think time when appropriate: 100% (3/3)   
- Corrects all errors (group and individual): 67% (2/3)   
- Provides delayed tests for missed items: 100% (3/3)   
- Has good pacing: 100% (3/3)   
- Monitoring of Independent Work: Not observed  
  
Universal Screening Benchmark Data (CIS #5)  
Methodology and data is described under prompt, "Has the state collected additional data?"  
  
IEP File Folder Reviews (CIS # 1, 3, 4, 5)  
Methodology and data described under prompt, “Has the state collected additional data?”  
  
Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) Observations (CIS # 1, 3, 4, 5)  
In January 2021, classroom observations were scheduled for 5 students as they were receiving their SDI for reading. Only 3 observations were conducted as 2 students were absent. The purpose of the observations was to ascertain behavior change in the delivery of the SDI and reading instruction of resource room teachers. This behavior change is related to the PD provided on using the Reading Mastery program. In addition, the observations were also used to verify if the SDI indicated in the IEP was aligned with instruction. Observations were aligned with the IEP file folder reviews as those students observed were those whose IEPs were reviewed. The following information was gathered from the observations:  
· Observations revealed that the SDI for reading was being delivered in the resource room by the special education teacher, which is the location and responsible person specified in each student’s IEP. For one student’s IEP, the regular classroom teacher is also listed as a responsible person for providing SDI in reading in the general education classroom.  
· The duration of time listed in the IEP for SDI in reading corresponded with the time allotted to each student in the resource room classroom. Since one IEP lists the regular classroom teacher as a responsible person for SDI in reading, that student receives additional time for SDI in the general education setting.  
· Observations demonstrated that the content of the SDI for reading aligned with skills listed on the IEP for each student. Content of the SDI included activities focused on reading fluency, decoding, and word recognition.  
  
Parent Interviews (CIS #2)  
Telephone interviews were conducted with parents of children who attended the four SSIP schools. Interviewers asked parents 6 standard questions. Sixty-eight (68) families of students with disabilities across the 4 SSIP schools were identified, and 65 parents were able to be contacted via phone. Of those, 37% (24/65) completed the interview. The following provides a summary of the questions asked in the phone interviews.  
   
The majority of children are currently learning in face-to-face mode (92%). Regarding impacts of the pandemic since March 2020, many addressed the barriers of online learning. Many parents noted that their child was not making the same academic progress when they were in online mode and noted that being back to face-to-face learning has been a positive experience. Several parents noted impacts related to their child’s social and emotional health and how the online mode did not support this aspect of learning. A few described struggles in supporting their child at home during online learning, one noting that the technology issues were particularly challenging. Several parents noted positive experiences, both academic and social/emotional, since school returned to face-to-face learning.  
   
Parents described ways in which the school had helped them and/or their child improve reading. Most noted that the resources provided – books, websites, printed materials – were helpful. Others noted that the regular communication was beneficial to understanding their child’s progress, and for understanding how to support their child reading at home. Parents described how teachers used multiple modes to communicate with them about their child’s reading. These included WhatsApp, texts, emails, phone calls, video calls, and newsletters. All parents were positive about the communication from their school. Many parents noted that particular reading programs their child was engaged in were helpful. Two parents noted specifically that the one-to-one instruction teachers provided was helpful to their child.  
   
When asked about supports they need from the school, most parents noted that they would like the supports currently in place to continue for their child. This included effective communication, as well as books/materials, and online resources. A few parents noted that they would like more time for the strategies (e.g., one-to-one) used for their child’s reading instruction since these have been effective. Others noted having access to the technology and software at home would be helpful to their child’s reading.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the district shifted to virtual engagement for instruction, professional development, and resources. The goal for the district remained the same but the context shifted to encompass a virtual environment. In pivoting to online learning, teachers had to develop a new skill-set that was focused on how to effectively teach and provide evidence-based practices in a virtual environment. In moving to a virtual context, the SSIP schools also pivoted to using online resources. Online resources the SSIP schools implemented were the Raz-Plus online leveled readers and FastForWord (FFW), a brain-based reading program for students with IEPs. These online resources served as a supplement to the core instruction and interventions being provided to students. Raz-Plus supports the implementation of the 5 Components of Reading as its online activities focus on the different components of reading. Additionally, the leveled reading activities specifically target fluency and comprehension as students must listen to, read, and answer questions about the story. Levels are aligned with aimswebPlus, DRA-2, and Fountas & Pinnell assessments that are used at the SSIP schools. Furthermore, lesson plans provided on the Raz-Plus platform are structured following the elements of explicit instruction (modeling, guided practice, and independent practice). In addition, Raz-Plus is aligned with specific Common Core State Standards (CCSS) set by GDOE as its priority standards. FFW provides intensive intervention for struggling readers and addresses the root causes and deficits in executive functions that may impact reading performance. The Reading Progress Indicator (RPI) used in FFW is also aligned with four reading components. These components are: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension. Now that the district is implementing in-person instruction along with online instruction, the online tools still serve as valuable supports for students and families.  
  
Raz-Plus participation rates across the 4 SSIP schools for grades K-3 for this reporting period is at 39%. This is a 15% increase from FFY 2019. For students with disabilities in K-3 in the SSIP schools, the participation rate is at 63%. At one SSIP school (M.U. Lujan Elementary), performance data for 2nd-5th grade students in the Spring 2021 aimswebPlus benchmark assessment was examined in combination with Raz-Plus student usage data. The analysis showed that 19% (41/220) of students who used the program as a supplement to their core reading instruction were on benchmark (45th percentile) for ORF. In contrast, for students who did not use the program, only 11% (11/103) were on benchmark. For Reading Comprehension (RC), 31% (68/220) of 2nd-5th grade students who used the program were on benchmark (45th percentile). However, only 20% (20/103) of students who did not use the program were on benchmark for RC.  
  
For FFW, all four SSIP schools are currently utilizing the program. Participation rates for K-5 students across the four SSIP schools is at 39%. Data indicated that 23 out of 24 students with IEPs on the FFW program, or 96%, scored at the "struggling level," as measured by the RPI. Students who score at the "struggling level" fall between the 1st-29th percentiles (this is indicative of students who score with minimal success in fundamental skills). One student with an IEP, or 4%, scored at the "emerging level," scoring between the 30th- 54th percentiles (indicative of partial mastery of skills). Students with IEPs will complete a follow up assessment after each FFW component. Since not all four SSIP schools participated in FFW in FFY 2019, an accurate comparison of performance from FFY2019 and FFY2020 cannot be made at this time.  
  
Both data pieces support the continued implementation of activities that focus on the 5 Components of Reading Instruction and on explicit instruction.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Next Steps for Universal Screener: Aligned with CIS #5  
- Continued training on data literacy using the universal screener  
- Training on progress monitoring  
- Continued training on using data from the universal screener to develop PDSAs  
- Continued observations of the administration of the universal screener to ensure that data is being collected with fidelity.  
  
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:  
- Increased knowledge and skills in data-based decision making  
- Increased proficiency in administering the universal screener with fidelity  
- Increased knowledge and skills in implementing progress monitoring  
- Early identification of students at-risk for reading difficulty  
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools on benchmark in reading as measured by the district assessment.  
  
Next Steps for Continuous Improvement (Plan, Do, Study, Act-PDSAs): Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5  
- Continued training on using data from the universal screener to develop PDSAs  
- Training on the selection of evidence-based practices for PDSAs  
- Coaching on the development of classroom PDSAs.  
  
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:  
- Increased knowledge and skill in developing classroom PDSAs  
- Increased knowledge and skill in selecting evidence-based practices for PDSAs  
- All students receive instruction in the core curriculum  
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools on benchmark in reading as measured by the district assessment.  
  
Next Steps for Explicit Instruction: Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5  
- Continued training and coaching for RRTs on DI Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading programs  
- Continued training and coaching on explicit instruction components  
- Classroom observations and feedback on the delivery of explicit instruction.  
  
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:  
- Increased knowledge and skill in the delivery of explicit instruction  
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools on benchmark in reading as measured by the district assessment.  
  
Next Steps for Five (5) Components of Reading Instruction: Aligned with CIS #1, 2, 3, 4, 5  
- Continued training and coaching on developing PDSAs centered on the components of reading  
- Continued training and coaching on selecting specific evidence-based practices for each of the 5 components of reading instruction.  
  
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:  
- Increased knowledge and skill in the selection of evidence-based practices for each of the 5 components of reading  
- Increased knowledge and skill in developing PDSAs centered on the 5 components of reading instruction  
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools on benchmark in reading as measured by the district assessment.  
  
Next Steps for Coaching: Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5  
- Development of a systematic coaching system.  
  
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:  
- Teachers are knowledgeable about evidence-based instruction, intervention, and universal screening tools  
- Teachers implement evidence-based strategies learned through PD and coaching with fidelity   
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools on benchmark in reading as measured by the district assessment.  
  
Next Steps for Professional Learning Communities (PLCs): Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5  
- Continued use of the PLC as a mechanism for the implementation of data-based decision making, PDSAs, and job-embedded training and coaching  
- Continued training on the implementation of effective PLCs.  
  
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:  
- Teachers are knowledgeable about evidence-based instruction, intervention, and universal screening tools  
- Teachers implement evidence-based strategies learned through PD and coaching with fidelity   
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools on benchmark in reading as measured by the district assessment.  
  
Next Steps for Family Engagement: Aligned with CIS # 2  
- Conduct a needs assessment with families in identifying their needs and how the school can best support them in promoting reading at home  
- Work with families in identifying what strategies are most effective in facilitating family participation in workshops and training sessions  
- Continued participation in GDOE's SPDG which works with family groups to build a responsive and relevant professional development system.  
  
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:  
- Parents are knowledgeable about strategies for supporting reading at home and in the community  
- Students enjoy reading and make the connection of reading at home to or with parents  
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools on benchmark in reading as measured by the district assessment.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:  
  
- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.  
  
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters (Indicators 6, 7, and 12); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).  
  
- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held, one was held in-person, while the other was held virtually, to review all the Indicators in the SPP/APR.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target Setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.  
  
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR Target setting handouts and PPT presentation were provided to Guam Education Board Members and all School Administrators.  
  
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.  
  
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2019-2020, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.  
  
- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.  
  
- Five virtual sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the improvement activities, the proposed targets, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP.  
  
Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:  
  
August 31; October 31; December 14; January 3 & 6, 2022: Focus group sessions for the Early Childhood Clusters were conducted with the teachers and service providers to review the data, conduct drill down sessions to determine reasons for progress or slippage in the performance in the Indicators, review improvement strategies, and to establish proposed targets for review with additional stakeholders during larger group sessions.  
  
September 9 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended the introductory and overview session on the SPP/APR. These parents are composed of members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
October 12, 2021: At a regularly scheduled advisory panel meeting held virtually, 5 parents attended another presentation on the requirements for stakeholder and parent engagement, along with target setting tips for the SPP/APR and the SSIP.  
  
October 1 and November 19, 2021: Focus group sessions were held with Division and school personnel on the Secondary Clusters, which included school administrators and case managers, to discuss progress and slippage for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Ways in which to improve performance with these Indicators were also discussed, along with possible targets for each of the Indicators.   
  
December 29 and January 6, 2022: Focus group sessions with Division personnel and the administrators from the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to review the SiMR, the improvement activities, the evaluation plan, and the proposed targets for the SSIP.  
  
January 4, 2022: Focus group session to discuss possible questions to pose during the scheduled Parent Forums for Indicator 8, and to discuss the SiMR and come up with proposed targets for the SSIP. 6 parents attended the focus group session. The 6 parents composed of members from the GAPSD, a Guam Education Board (GEB) member who represents parents, and parents from parent groups such as the Autism Communities Together (ACT) and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 7, 2022: Focus group session held with Division personnel to review the SPP/APR; performance was discussed for each Indicator, along with improvement activities developed to improve performance and proposed targets beginning from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. Within the group, there were 4 parents and 2 grandparents of children with disabilities.   
  
January 8 & 11, 2022: Large Stakeholder sessions were held virtually and in-person to review the entire SPP/APR. 4 parents attended the Large Stakeholder session that was conducted in person. These parents are members of the GAPSD and individual parents. Nineteen (19) parents were in attendance during the virtual session. These parents are not members of any parent group but have voiced their interest in improving the results for their children with disabilities.  
  
January 10 & 14, 2022: Focus group sessions were held with Resource Room Teachers and Case Managers to review data on School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16). Discussions surrounding the reasons for the performance for these Indicators occurred, possible ways in which to increase performance, and what the end goal or targets should look like by FFY 2025.  
  
January 12, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the virtual Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are part of GAPSD, in addition to being members of ACT and the Down Syndrome Society.  
  
January 15, 2022: There were 4 parents who attended the in-person Parent Forum session to discuss Indicator 8. These parents are members of GAPSD.  
  
January 20, 2022: A focus group meeting was scheduled and held with the parents of children attending the SSIP Schools. The purpose of the meeting was to gather their thoughts on how their children were doing in Reading, a description of what the schools were doing to increase their child’s reading skills, and to get their input on improvement activities and the proposed targets for this next cycle of the SSIP. There were 3 parents who attended the virtual session to discuss the SSIP. These parents have children attending the SSIP schools.   
  
January 26, 2022: A focus group meeting with Teacher Leaders, inclusive of special education teachers from the SSIP schools, was scheduled and held to review the data, improvement activities, evaluation plan, and proposed targets.

Additional information on stakeholder input sessions:  
  
Stakeholder involvement and input on the progress of the SSIP is an ongoing process throughout the year. In fact, on every 2nd Friday of the month, there is an SSIP Core Team meeting to review the progress on the improvement activities to address the outcomes described in the SSIP. This Core Team is made up of individuals from the Division of Special Education, which includes the Consulting Resource Teachers/Technical Assistants (CRT/TAs), the GDOE Instructional Coaches (ICs), the Administrators of the SSIP Schools, a few Teacher Leaders from the SSIP Schools, and a parent member from the Guam Advisory Panel of Students with Disabilities (GAPSD).  
  
In addition to the monthly meetings, in order to address the specific requirements for the FFY 2020 SSIP, several small group sessions were held with stakeholders:  
- December 10, 2021 (SSIP Core Team)  
- December 29, 2021 (SSIP Core Team)  
- January 4, 2022 (Parent focus group to discuss the SIMR and proposed targets)  
- January 6, 2022 (SSIP Core Team)  
- January 20, 2022 (Parents of children enrolled in SSIP Schools)  
- January 26, 2022 (Teacher Leaders)  
  
The Core Team met on several occasions and reviewed past performances of the 3rd grade students with IEPs in their schools. This data drill down exercise initiated the start of conversations to propose new targets for the SSIP. To begin, the SSIP targets starting from FFY 2014 through FFY 2018 were reviewed and compared with the actual achievement data submitted for each year in order to determine if there were any changes that would note progress or slippage.   
  
The stakeholders noted the increase in performance in the initial years of the SSIP and then the drop in performance in FFY 2018. There was no data to report for FFY 2019 because of the impact of COVID-19. The data for FFY 2020 is reported   
  
A concern was raised by one of the SSIP Principals involving the small number of students in the 3rd grade. Before targets were proposed, there was a suggestion to look at the number of potential 3rd graders for each FFY so that possible performance percentages could be calculated for each year. Another suggestion was to “eyeball” the data and make educated guesses about possible increases in performance. Additionally, comparison data between students with IEPs in the 3rd grade were made with general education students in the 3rd grade, especially for FFY 2020.   
  
Eventually, stakeholders decided to propose targets starting from the ground up, at 0%, whereby the targets would remain steady for two consecutive years; and work upwards by increasing the targets by 5% over the course of the 2 consecutive years. Thus, the proposal was to have targets remain at 0% for two years, then increase to 5% for the next two years, and finally, be at 10% for the last two remaining years.   
  
Some of the reasons stakeholders used to justify this proposal included the following:  
- Data for FFY 2020 is not complete; not all students participated in the ACT Aspire  
- Data for FFY 2021 will be the last year ACT Aspire will be administered; GDOE will be utilizing a new assessment tool for its summative assessment for the FFY 2022 reporting period  
  
Other considerations suggested was to review and revise the targets for the next SSIP reporting period, and explore the possibility of utilizing an alternative assessment tool that would reflect what our students with IEPs know and are able to do in reading.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

Small focus group meetings were held virtually with the stakeholder groups, which involved the Core Team members, parents from the GAPSD. Each meeting was announced via email as email invitations were sent out to the specific groups: Core Team, Teacher Leaders and Special Education Teachers, and parents of children with IEPs enrolled in the SSIP Schools. A flyer was specifically made for the session with parents who had children enrolled in the SSIP schools. There was also a focus group meeting held with parent members of the GAPSD. The discussion with the GAPSD parents involved the continuation of the SIMR for the SSIP, the continued use of the improvement strategies, and the historical data for the SSIP, along with questions surrounding proposed targets for this SSIP submission through FFY 2025.  
  
Additionally, during the monthly SSIP meetings, CORE Team members discussed these agenda items as they arose:   
- The results of previous and current summative and secondary data (aimswebPlus) for the SSIP   
- Fidelity checks of aimswebPlus administration; fidelity of reading instruction; and SDI observations;   
- Coaching sessiions with teachers in preparation for IEP meetings and IEP meeting observations;  
- Continued training on PDSA, explicit instruction, and reading strategies;   
- Progress on meeting the outcomes and completing the activities in the Evaluation Plan.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

One concern stakeholders raised surrounded target setting because of the low number of 3rd grade students enrolled in the SSIP Schools. To address the concern, data was provided to show the potential number of students who would be in the 3rd grade for a particular FFY; as an example, the number of students who are in the 2nd grade this year could be potential 3rd grade students reported in FFY 2022.   
  
Once this data was presented, stakeholders felt more comfortable with setting targets. In the end and after all focus group sessions were completed, stakeholders agreed on the targets that were proposed for the SSIP beginning FFY 2020 through FFY 2025, with the understanding that the baseline and targets may be reviewed and revised, as needed.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

Activities to be implemented in the next fiscal year that are related to the SIMR will be focused on the scale-up process. GDOE will scale-up in two distinct ways: through widespread implementation of reading evidence-based practices with the addition of three more target schools for a total of seven SSIP schools; and through deep changes in classroom practices with the addition of math evidence-based content strategies. Moreover, the scale-up process will be in conjunction with GDOE's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) which establishes a professional development system centered on developing agency, choice, and engagement with stakeholders using the Leading by Convening framework. The SPDG is also focused on sustainability and broad implementation of evidenced-based practices for reading.   
  
The core tasks for the scale-up process will include:  
- developing and providing support for implementation;  
- ensuring implementation to fidelity at each school site; and  
- evaluating and improving the scale-up process.  
  
Using the steps from the Institute of Education Sciences Continuous Improvement in Education: A Toolkit for Schools and Districts (2020), the following activities will be conducted in the next fiscal year for the new SSIP schools to address the core tasks for scaling up:  
  
Overarching Activity: GDOE provides guidance and support to help SSIP schools develop a framework of supports based on needs and readiness.  
  
Sub-activities:  
  
Part 1: Planning a Continuous Improvement Effort  
- Assess the school’s readiness to engage in a continuous improvement effort  
- Determine the overall focus of the continuous improvement effort  
- Recruit Improvement Team members  
- Identify Improvement Team members roles and responsibilities  
- Plan the Improvement Team calendar  
  
Part 2: Improvement Team Meetings  
- Introduction to continuous improvement  
- Defining the problem and determining root causes using a fish diagram  
- Establishing an aim and developing a driver diagram  
- Preparing for PDSA Cycles  
  
Part 3: Professional Development  
- Integrate implementation support practitioners (ISPs) to support new schools  
- Provide professional development to teachers on the continuous improvement cycle  
- Provide professional development to teachers on data-based decision making.  
  
Overarching Activity: GDOE identifies evidence-based math interventions and provides professional development on math instruction.  
For the current four SSIP schools, they will be scaling-up by adding depth to their classroom practice by adding on the math content. Since the current SSIP schools have been engaged in the continuous improvement framework for the last six years and have completed a math “Taking Stock” and needs assessment, they will begin with understanding the content and pedagogy of teaching math. The scale-up to Math at the current SSIP schools will begin with grades K-3 and will involve training, follow-up activities, and observations to ensure implementation to fidelity. It will be an ongoing process of continually learning, applying, and adapting content.  
  
As Guam Part B is in its initial planning phase of scaling out with math content, an additional SIMR to address math will be included in the next SSIP reporting period.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

Timeline for activities related to the SIMR:  
  
Overarching Activity: GDOE provides guidance and support to help SSIP schools develop a framework of supports based on needs and readiness.  
Part 1: Planning a Continuous Improvement Effort: Spring 2022 to Summer 2022  
Part 2: Improvement Team Meetings: Fall 2022  
Part 3: Professional Development: Spring 2023  
  
  
Expected short-term outcome for activities:  
- Administrators understand how to support implementation of evidence-based reading instruction.  
  
Overarching Activity: GDOE identifies evidence-based math interventions and provides professional development on math instruction.  
- Training on evidence-based math interventions: Spring 2022 to Spring 2023  
- Small-group follow-up sessions: Spring 2022 to Spring 2023  
- Classroom Observations: Fall 2022 to Spring 2023  
  
Expected short-term outcome for activities:  
- Teachers are knowledgeable of evidence-based math instruction, interventions, and universal screening tools.

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

Newly identified barriers and steps to address these barriers are described below:  
  
Recruitment and retention of certified teachers  
This reporting period saw an increase in vacancies for certified teachers for both special education and general education. Two SSIP schools grappled with vacancies for special education positions and one SSIP school had 8 teacher vacancies. Addressing this barrier involves community collaboration to determine what supports teachers need to stay in the teaching profession. This will involve working with GDOE’s mentors and with community leaders. Exacerbating the lack of certified teachers, COVID-19 has added to teacher fatigue and burnout and an increase in teacher absences due to infections. Leveraging district personnel such as instructional coaches and CRT-TAs to cover vacant classes will assist in addressing the teacher shortage in GDOE.  
  
Time for professional development (PD) and to review teaching practices  
An upsurge in COVID-19 infections has impacted job-embedded PD as schools must scramble to find coverage for classes leading to the cancellation of job-embedded PD sessions. Steps to address this will be to provide continuing education credits for teachers who attend sessions held after-school or on the weekends. Another step to address this barrier would be to record PD sessions and create a library of PD sessions that teachers can access when job-embedded PD time is available.  
  
Stable Leadership   
For evidence-based practices to be firmly rooted in school systems, stable leadership is crucial. Next to teachers, principals are the second most important school-level factor impacting student achievement. A barrier to the sustainability of evidence-based practices is frequent changes in school leadership. One SSIP school has had six principals in six years. As a consequence, implementation levels for evidence-based practices are lower in that school in comparison to the other SSIP schools. Steps to address this barrier include ensuring that the district commits to not moving principals at the SSIP schools. In addition, as new principals take the helm at an SSIP school, they must also commit to staying for at least 5 years at the school.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
Guam provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps Guam has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 17 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Chief State School Officer

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Thomas Babauta

**Title:**

Assistant Superintendent of Special Education

**Email:**

tcbabauta@gdoe.net

**Phone:**

(671)777-7732

**Submitted on:**

04/27/22 7:51:51 PM
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